PUBLICATIONS OF
S.V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
TIRUPATI

The following is the list of publications available for sale at prices mentioned against them. S.V. University Oriental Journal is the only multi-lingual publication. It contains articles in English, Sanskrit and Telugu. In some of the numbers articles in Tamil or Hindi also are published.

S.No.	Particulars of Work		Price
			Rs.Ps.
1.	S.V. University Oriental Journal Vol. I Parts 1 & 2	(1958)	10-00
2.	-do- Vol. VII Parts 1 & 2	(1964)	10-00
3.	-do- Vol. VIII Parts 1 & 2	(1965)	10-00
4.	-do- Vol. IX Parts 1 & 2	(1966)	10-00
5.	-do- Vol. X Parts 1 & 2	(1967)	10-00
6.	-do- Vol. XI Parts 1 & 2	(1968)	10-00
7.	-do- Vol. XII Parts 1 & 2	(1969)	10-00
8.	-do- Vol. XIII Parts 1 & 2	(1970)	10-00
9.	Gajagrahaṇaprakāra of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita Edited with Introduction by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.	1968	2-50
10.	Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇyasādhanam of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda Edited with Introduction, English Translation and Notes by Prof. E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.	1968	0-75
11.	Kāvyāmṛtam of Śrīvatsalāñchana Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971	3-25
12.	Kamalāvilāsabhaṇa of Nārāyaṇakavi Edited with Introduction by Dr. K. S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971	0-50

13. Vijayavikramavyāyoga of Āryasūrya
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. K. S. Ramamurti, M.A.,Ph D. 1!

14. An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit, Telugu and Tamil Manuscripts (Palm-leaf and Paper) in the Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Research Institute Library, Tirupati 19

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

15. Pradyumnacaritramu (Telugu) of Muppirāla Subbarāyakavi
Edited with Introduction and Notes by
Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A.,Ph.D.

16. Kṛṣṇavilāsa (a Kāvya in 11 cantos) of Puṇyakoṭi with Vyākhyāna
Edited with Introduction by
Dr. K. S. Ramamurti, M.A.,Ph.D.

---

1. All the above Publications are now supplied only on pre of cost and postage either by money-order or dema payable to the Registrar of this University.

 This condition of pre-payment may be relaxed extent in the case of Registered Publishers, Local Librai rities, Universities, Affiliated Colleges and other recogni cational Institutions in India on correspondence. A discount of 5% to 10% may be allowed to them on t merits.

2. A trade discount of 25% is allowed to all the Register sellers only.

3. The annual subscription rates of the S. V. University Journal are as follows :

1.	Inland	...	Rs. 15/- (Post free)
2.	Foreign*	...	£ 1 and 15 shillings or 4 Dollars.

*The Journal is sent post free by Surface mail, t party requires it to be despatched by air-mail, the charges have to be borne by the party.

N.B: The foreign rates of volumes I to XIII are 20 Sh 2 Dollars and 50 cents.

CONTENTS

ENGLISH

1. Evidence for Plus Juncture in old Indo-Aryan
Dr. H.S. Ananthanarayana ... 1

2. Some thoughts on Ancient Indian Poetics
Dr. Chitra P. Shukla ... 13

3. Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha as the Interpreters of the Yājñavalkya-smṛti
Dr. S.G. Moghe ... 19

4. On the authorship of Yajñaphalanāṭaka
Dr. J. Chenna Reddy ... 31

5 Object – Philosophical and Grammatical – in Sanskrit Tradition
Dr. Siddheswar Varma ... 39

6. Kṛṣṇa in Hindi Literature
Dr. V.P. Singh ... 45

7. Prakṛti and Puruṣa in Sāṃkhya-kārikā
Dr. A.D. Shastri ... 51

8. Harihara and his contribution to Kannaḍa Literature
Sri B.C. Javali ... 59

9. Influence of Sanskrit on Tamil Literature
Dr. V. Varadachari ... 69

10. Two Versions of the Ekasaṃjñādhikāra
Sri M.S. Narayana Murti ... 75

11. Miscellaneous
(i) A note on the date of Vedāntadeśika
Dr. V.N. Hari Rao ... 85

(ii) Certain aspects of Caste System among th
Southern Tamils at the Beginning of Modern tim
Dr. K. Rajayyan

SANSKRIT

12. परिज्ञानजिज्ञासा
... *Sri D.T. Tatacharya*

13. कारणत्रयविभागविमर्शः
Sri N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya

TELUGU

14. ఇరుగు పొరుగు సాహిత్యప్రక్రియలు – కన్నడము, మలయాళము
Dr. T. Kodandaramaiah

15. అద్వైత వేదాంత సిద్ధాంత తత్త్వము
Sri K. Dakshina Murthy

HINDI

16. भारतीय काव्यशास्त्र की रूपरेखा
... *Dr. R.K. Jain*

Dr. H.S. ANANTHANARAYANA

EVIDENCE FOR PLUS JUNCTURE IN OLD INDO-ARYAN

For the Hindu grammarians *pada*, 'word' was the basic linguistic unit of syntax; they, therefore, discussed accent in words[1] and *sandhi* between words. The *vākya*, 'sentence' as a whole never received their attention. There have been studies however on Old Indo-Aryan demonstrating a relationship between the incidence of pitch accent and the type of clauses. Vocatives, for example, have no pitch accent if they stand with in a clause[2]; particles which are unmarked for accent occupy 'second position' in the clause.[3] It may, therefore, be possible to determine the relationship between some pitch patterns and terminal junctures. In addition to terminal junctures, there seems to be evidence for a junctural feature within a clause and the present study is an attempt at bringing such evidence from the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, the earliest available prose text in Indo-Aryan. Besides its conservatism in accentuation, as well as in syntax and lexicon, the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, is closely related to the *Vedas* in its diction. Restrictions on phonotactic occurrence, of consonants and of vowels, as well as morphological evidence are used to set up the presence of a juncture.

Certain sequences of vowels and of consononts which do not occur within a word are, however, possible across words within an utterance. Generally, only homorganic nasals and plosives occur in sequence. Dental nasal, for example, is not tolerated before non-homorganic

---

1. *anudātta : padamekavarjam*, Pāṇini VI. i. 158.
2. *āmantritasya ca*, ibid. VIII. i. 19.
3. Delbrück, B., 1878, *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Śatapathabrāhmaṇa dargestellt*, Halle, p. 48; also
   Wackerngel, J., 1892, 'Uberein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *Indo-germaeische Forschungen* I, p. 333.

plosives. In such instances, the nasal will be assimilated to the homorganic nasal of the class of the following consonant.

E.g., *saptānnahomāñjuhoti*[4] (1.3.8.1)[5], '(He) sacrifices seven *Annahomas*.'.

Sequences like *-np-*, *-nbh-*,[6] however, occur across word boundaries, in an utterance, without being assimilated.

E.g., *tān poṣān puṣyati* (2.3.3.2), '(He) obtains (all) that prosperity'.

bahoreva bhūyān bhavati (2.2.3.3), '(He) becomes exceedingly great.'

Instances of this kind, where assimilation does not take place, provide evidence for the presence of a junctural feature, since otherwise the sequence is not possible. I, therefore, assume a juncture and write it with a plus. The above utterances then will be written in the following way.

tān+poṣān+puṣyati (2 3.3.2),

bahoreva bhūyān+bhavati (2.2.3.3).

Similarly, the sequences *-ng-*, *-nk-*, and *-nh-* are not possible within a word, but they too are found across word boundaries. In the sequences below I set up a juncture.

n+voiced stop

somagrhān+gṛhṇāti (1.3.3.3), '(He) takes the bowl of Soma juice'. *payaevātman+gṛheṣu paśuṣu dhatte* (1.4.3.3), 'Bestows strength for himself and milk for his cattle',

nidānavān+bhavati (2.2.11.6), 'He becomes the possessor of Nidāna',

4. Examples are cited without accent marks since the latter do not in any way contribute to the present discussion on plus juncture.

5. The references in parentheses are to the *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa*. They may be read accordingly: the first figure refers to the *Aṣṭaka* 'book', the second to the *Adhyāya* 'chapter', the third to the *Anuvāka* 'section', and the fourth to the *Mantra* 'verse'.

6. Emeneau, M.B., 1946, 'The Nasal Phonemes of Sanskrit', *Language* 22, p. 88.

paśumān+bhavati (1.1.2.8), 'He abounds in cattle.'

n+voiceless stop

vyantān+karoti (2.1.3.1), 'Separates (the coal)',

viṣṇukramān+kramate (1.3.5.4), 'Strides the (three) Viṣṇu's steps',

na grāmyān+paśūn+hinasti (1.6.10.3), 'Does not harm the domestic animals',

māsmān+prāpannarātayaḥ (2.4.2.3), 'May not the enemies reach us'

ŋ+h

ayāsan+havyamūhiṣe (2.4.1.9), 'Being omnipresent, (you) carry the oblation',

gṛhān+ha dāhuko bhavati (1.1.2.2), 'It becomes the conflagration of the houses',

Another sequence of a nasal and a plosive is found in the following :

ŋ+p

udan+paryāvṛtyācāmati (2.1.4.7), 'Sips water, turning to the north.'

A sequence of a plosive and a sibilant provides evidence for junctural feature as in the following:

t+ṣ

tābhissaṃrabdho avidat+ṣaḍurvīḥ (2.5.2.1), 'With them, stimulated obtained the six terrestrial spaces.'

Vowel sequences, which are generally coalesced within a word, may occur without coalescence across words. I shall assume a juncture in these instances too, since such a feature permits us to explain the absence of coalescence. These may be classified under two groups, since in one group such sequences arise mostly from the loss of final *-s;* in the other, there is no such loss.

I. i. ā+ā

tato no maha+āvaha (2.4.1.8), 'Bring then to us the glory',

tubhyaṃ devā+adhibravan (2.7.16.1), 'The gods spoke to you',

pūṣemā+āśā+anuveda sarvāḥ (2.4.1.5), 'Pūṣan knew all these regions'

ii. a+ī

vi na+indra mṛdho jahi (2.4.6.5), 'O Indra, Vanquish our foes,'

devam martāsa+īḍate (2.4.1.4), 'The men beseech (you), O God',

uttame nāka+iha mādayantām (3.1.1.12), 'Rejoice here in this highest heaven.'

iii. ā+ū

ardha+upamanthati (1.6.8.4), 'Stirs half (of it),'

apa+upasṛjati (1.4.3.3), 'Causes water to flow',

ta+ūrṇāvabhayo 'bhavan (1.1.2.5), 'They became spiders,'

sañjanānā+upāsata (2.4.4.5), 'Knowing their alliance (the gods) enjoyed (their share).'

iv. ā+ṛ

kalpante'smā+ṛtavaḥ (2.2.11.3), The season serve him',

...yaśa+ṛcchati, (2 2.1.5), '...fame falls on to him.'

v. ā+e

puṇyāha+eva kurute (1.5.2.1), 'Performs indeed on a good day',

bha+evāvarundhe (1.1.3.12), 'Drives light away'.

vi. ā+o

svadante'smā+oṣadhayaḥ (2.1.1.3), 'The herbs are palatable to him',

kalpantām āpa+oṣadhīḥ (1.2.1.18), 'May the water and the herbs prosper',

prāśnanti brāhmaṇā+odanam (1.1.9.3), 'The priests eat boiled rice'.

II. i. ā+ā

udañca+āvartante (1.3.6.6), 'They turn towards the north',

kiṃ kiṃvā+akaramiti (2.2.10.3), 'What, what have I accomplished'.

etadvā+agnihotram mithunam (2.1.5.4), 'This (forms) a pair of Agnihotra.'

ii. ā+u

anūca+unnayati (2.1.3.6), '(one ladle) follows the other',

ūrgvā+udumbaraḥ (1.1.3.10), 'The fig tree (is) invigoration'.

iii. ā+e

uta vā+eṣā'śvaṃ sūte (1.8.6.4), 'Either this bears a horse...'.

iv. e+a

agne naya supathā rāye+asmān (2.8.2.3), 'O Agni, lead us on a good path for wealth',

namas te+as tu bhagavaḥ (2.3.10.1), 'O Venerable, homage be to you.'

v. ī+a

te viyatī+abrūtām (1.1.3.2), 'They spoke to the sky'.

vi. ī+u

ā'yaṃ pṛṇaktu rajasī+upastham (2.7.8.2), 'May this (chariot) pervade both heaven and earth and the sky'.

vii. ū+ā

aśvinau hi devānām adhvaryū+āstām (3.2.2.1). 'The Aśvins indeed were the priests of gods'.

viii. ū+u

bāhū+udgṛhṇāti (1.7.6.8), '...raises his arms.'

Allomorphic conditioning provides evidence for word boundaries, for example,

taṃ prajā+anvasṛjyanta (2.1.2.1.), 'Created beings after him.' compare:

prajāḥ paśava+ime lokāḥ (2.2.3 3), 'People, cattle and these worlds'.

Prajāḥ and *prajā* have to be considered allomorphs of one morpheme, since *prajā* occurs before voiced phonemes and *prajāḥ* before voiceless phonemes. Therefore *prajā* may be set off from the following segment. We have already assumed a juncture in such a case on the evidence of phonotactic restriction. The allomorph *prajā* is also found before voiced consonants as in the following :

dānakāmā+asmai praja bhavanti (2.3.5.4), 'His progeny will be desirous of offering gifts'.

I consider that the transition in *prajāḥ paśava-* is different from that found in *prajā bhavanti*. This difference in transition we may mark with the plus. Further, phonotactically, the sequence *-sb-* is not possible within a word. Therefore *s* is lost before a voiced consonant. It may be noted that in all the instances we have assumed a juncture on the evidence of phonotactive restrictions, the junctural feature falls at the word boundary. I, therefore, write the above example in the following way :

dānakāmā+asmai prajā+bhavanti (2.3.5.4).

Similarly sequences *-sd-*, *-sj-*, and *-sh-* are not permitted. I assume in all these instances, where *s* is lost, a juncture, since we may identify the allomorph on distributional criteria.

yā+divyā+āpaḥ payasā saṃbabhūvuḥ (2.7.15.4), 'The divine waters which were born with milk......'.

The allomorph *yāḥ*, with *s* becoming *visarga*, is found in instances where it is permitted to occur.

yāḥ purastāt prasravanti (3.7.4.1), 'Which flow in the east......'

When final *s* of words is lost before voiced consonants, the preceding vowel *a*>*o*. Here again I write a plus which will indicate the word boundary.

vi na+indra mṛdho+jahi (2.4.6.5), 'O Indra, vanquish our foes',

śruto+gaṇa+ā tvā viśantu (2.4.3.10), '(May Indra), famous among the gods enter you'.

compare

yajñam deveṣu naskṛdhi (2.4.2.3), 'Place our sacrifice in gods'.

nas and *no* are allomorphs conditioned by the environment.

Sequences *-sp-*, *-sy-*, *-sr-*, *-sv-*, and *-ss-* are possible both within words and across word boundaries. In the following instances, however, the final *s* is lost. Since in these instances too, by allomorphic identification we can set up the word boundary, I write it with a plus.

sa+satyam agnim cinute (3.12.5.10), 'He truly arranges fire'.

compare

tā no+devīssubhavāśśarma yacchata (3.5.12.1), 'May these easily invoked goddesses give us happiness.'

sa+punarvasvoragnim ādadhīta (1.1.2.3), 'He should kindle fire in *Punarvasu* constellation'.

compare

bṛhaspatirnaḥ paripātu paścāt (3.1.1.5), 'May Bṛhaspati guard us from behind.'

apo+yācāmi bheṣajam (2.5.8.6), 'I beg for healing water'.

compare

apaḥ praṇayati (3.2.4.1), 'Fetches watey'.

syonaṃ te sadanaṃ karomi (3.7.5.2), 'I make a place for your happiness.'

yo+rāya+īśe śatadāya+ukthyaḥ (2.8.1.4), Praiseworthy and giver of hundred gifts, who will himself be a master of wealth......'

compare

mā yaḥ somam imam pibāt (3.7.8.3), '(It) shall not (reach) him who drinks this *Soma*.'

rāyasposaṃ sahasriṇam (3.7.5.13), 'Thousandfold increase of wealth,'

devā+vā+ūrjaṃ vyabhajanta (1.1.3.10), 'The gods indeed distributed invigoration.'

compare

devāḥ pitaraḥ pitaro+devāḥ (3.7.5.4), 'O gods, protectors, O Manes, bright ones.'

Similarly, sequences *-sm-* and *-sn-* are possible with in a word, but across word boundaries *s* is lost before *m* and *n*.

tato+no+maha+āvaha (2.4.1.8), 'Bring then to us the glory.'

compare

tataste'bhavan (2.1.4.1), 'Therefore they became.'

tasmādevam āha (3.2.1.4), 'He, therefore, said this way.'

I have indicated only some instances where we have evidence for assuming a juncture within a clause. Such evidence is also found across clauses, which we do not define here. I may here point to the absence of coalescence across clause boundaries.

sarvā+enaṃ prajā+rājeti vadanti, etamutyam daśakṣipa+ityāha, āditya+vai prajāḥ (1.8.8.1), 'All the people call him king, (he) said that he is Daśakṣipa, the people are the Ādityas.'

vācodyanti, udvatirbhavanti (1.8.8.2), 'They increase by speech, they become lofty.'

The presence of the juncture feature in the above instances may be contrasted with what may be called 'smooth transition'.[7] In sequences of consonants, smooth transition involves one of two chances: change of manner or change of position of articulation. Consonant sequences of differing manner change to sequences of the same manner of articulation, for example,

ll for *tl*, and *gdh* for *kdh*.

yallājairjuhoti (3.8.14 4), 'Who worships with parched grain......'

bhiṣagdhenussarasvatī, (2.6.11.4), 'Healing cow is Sarasvatī'.

Consonant sequences of differing position change to sequences of same position, for example, *jj* for *tj*, and *cc* for *tc*.

mūtrājjanayanti retaḥ (2.6.4.2), 'Produce semen near the urinal tract.'

yadupāvati ciccikaḥ (2.5.5.6), The Ciccika bird while it is nearby......'

7. For details, see Whitney, W.D., 1960, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 34-87, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

In vowel sequences, smooth transition involves lengthening, diphthongization and processes such as *i>y*.

tat prāśnāt (1.1.9.3), 'She ate that,'

priyeṇaivainaṃ dhāmnā samardhayati (1.1.9.6), 'Causes him to thrive in favorite abode,'

taṃ viśvakarmā bhūtvā'bhyajayat (1.2.3.3), 'Becoming the architect of the universe he conquered it.'

Our conclusions on the evidence for juncture feature within a clause may be compared with the treatment of such features by the native grammarians and Vedic phoneticians. They do not explicitly mention junctural features between the consonant sequences which we have described earlier. Yet some indication of junctural feature is implied in vowel sequences where coalescence never takes place. Such are the vowels, *ī*, *ū*, *e* in dual forms. These vowels are given a special name, *pragṛhya;*[8] since they do not coalesce with the following vowels, grammarians assume hiatus between them.

The particle *u*,[9] is also considered optionally a '*pragṛhya* vowel', for it does not coalesce with the preceding vowel; e.g.,

ya+u cainamevaṃ veda (2.7.10.2), 'He too, who this knew this...'

The *pragṛhya* vowels are indicated in the *Pada* text by an appended *iti*. For example, *asme iti;* before *iti*, *u*, is always written in its lengthened and nasalized form *ū iti*.

Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya mentions four instances of hiatus:[10]

pura etā, *tita unā*, *pra ugam*, and *nama uktibhiḥ*

These and hiatus arising from the *pragṛhya* vowel *u* are classifiable under our group I. The hiatus arising from *pragṛhya* vowel in dual forms may be put under our group II.

To sum up : we have evidence for one phoneme of juncture within a clause. It has four characteristic positions in which occurence can be demonstrated : one, between the consonant sequences which are possible

8. *īdūded dvivacanaṃ pragṛhyam*, Pāṇini I. i. 11.

9. *uñaḥ*, ibid. I. i. 17.

10. Shastri, M.D., 1931, *Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya* (ed. and trans.), Allahabad, II. 13.

only across words. Two are between vowel sequences; while some are genuine sequences of vowels, most of them result from loss of final *s* or from other reduction processes, such as *-e>a*, as in

saṃrujānāḥ pipiṣa+indraśatruḥ (2.5.4.4), 'Indra's enemy crushed (his own) breaking army.'

The fourth is between a vowel and a consonant which results from the loss of final *s* of the preceding word.

The junctural feature which we have indicated may also have occurred in other positions, but I have found no means for determining them. In determining the role of this junctural feature within the phonological system of Vedic, we may note its resemblance to final consonants of words which occur between final vowel and initial vowel :

e.g., *mahān annādaḥ* (3.9.10.1), 'great eater of food'.

compare

maha+āvaha (2.4.1.8), 'Bring glory.'

devān āsādaya (2.4.1.11), 'Seat the gods'.

compare

devā+adhibravan (2.7.16.1), 'Gods spoke'.

I tentatively assume that the role of this juncture was phonotactically equivalent to that of a consonant.[11] In the sequences of unexpected consonants interrupted by this juncture we would then assume clusters of at least three members. Between vowels plus is interpreted, of courrse as a single entity.

I have assumed for my description the phonemic analysis presented by Whitney and others. As an alternate phonemic analysis,[12] one might suggest that the vowels usually written as long vowels were sequences of two short vowels, e.g., *ā* is aa, *ī* ii, etc. By this system *e* would be analyzed as *ai*, *o* as *au*, so that one would arrive at the following vocalic nuclei for Sanskrit (omitting here *r*, *l*, and nuclei with *m* and *n*).

---

11. cf. Hockett, C.F., 1942, 'A System of Descriptive Phonology', *Language* 18, p. 17.

12. I owe this suggestion to Professor Werner Winter, now of the University of Kiel, who had served on my committee for Ph.D. at the University of Texas, U.S.A.

a	*i*	*u*	*ai*	*au*	*aai*
aa	*ii*	*uu*	*ia*	*ua*	*aau*

Several rules will be necessary to interpret these nuclei for example,

1. *a* remains vocalic while non –*a* becomes semivocalic
2. Identical vowels fuse into long vowels
3. When two different non –*a* vowels occur, the first becomes semivocalic

Then *iu* may be read as *yu*, *ui* as *vi*.

This analysis would reduce the number of vowels in Sanskrit and with the assumption of plus juncture, no ambiguity would result.
For example,

indra+iva (2.4.2.9): *upendra/upaindra/* (3.5.2.3) ....*agna+aahuta*

/a+a/ does not contrast with */aa/*

These then are distinguished by positing of a juncture. It is however beyond the scope of my study to discuss further the two possible phonemic analyses.[13]

13. The material presented here formed part of the author's Doctoral Dissertation submitted to and accepted for the University of Texas, U.S.A. in 1962.

Dr. CHITRA P. SHUKLA

SOME THOUGHTS ON ANCIENT INDIAN POETICS

Literature is a supreme expression of culture. The prominent characteristics of Indian culture is a quest for harmony. The ancient thinkers lay down four objectives of life - *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa*, and thereby seek to establish harmony in life through the discipline of the various urges of a person. Indian literature and literary criticism reflect the same tendency.

Ancient poets strictly followed the rules and regulations laid down by Ancient Poetics.

Bhāmaha, the most ancient critic, defined the *Kāvya* as *śabdārthau*. Word and sense constitute *Kāvya* according to Bhāmaha. Strains of music, though words, cannot be regarded as *Kāvya* because they do not convey any meaning to us. Gestures, though conveying sense, are not *Kāvya*, because they are not words. Poetry, therefore, must be word and sense. Bhāmaha thus seeks a harmony of words and sense in *Kāvya*. The invariable association of word and sense in *Kāvya* is emphasized by the later writers also. Mammaṭa defines *Kāvya* as *tad adoṣau śabdārthau saguṇau analaṅkṛitī punaḥ kvāpi*. Jagannātha tried to define *Kāvya* as *śabdaḥ*, but then, he had to add *ramaṇīyārthapratipādakatva* as a qualification to *śabda*.

An invariable association of the word and sense, however, is experienced in the sentences spoken in everyday life also. Words in *Kāvya* differ because we experience a particular beauty in *Kāvya*. The experience of beauty leads to the experience of delight, which is totally distinct from wordly pleasures and which is described as *akhaṇḍacarvaṇāsamāsādya*, *vigalitavedyāntara* and *brahmānandasahodara*. The harmony of word and sense, thus culminates into the harmony of beauty and delight.

Ancient Poetics again insists on a harmony of poetry and appreciation. The beauty of *Kāvya* is so subtle and its experience so profound that an ordinary person is not capable of this experience. Only those readers who have developed keen sensitiveness as a result of the constant reading of poetry, can experience the beauty and delight of poetry, because such persons can easily identify themselves with the objects of description. Persons incapable of appreciating *Kāvya* are looked down upon and this is evident in a verse like this :

itaratāpaśatāni yathecchayā vitara tāni sahe caturānana /
arasikeṣu rasābhinivedanaṃ śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha //

The appreciative readers are called *sahṛdayas*. Abhinavagupta defines the *sahṛdaya* as: *yeṣāṃ kāvyānuśīlanābhyāsavaśād viśadībhūte manomukure varṇanīyatanmayībhavanayogyatā te hṛdayasaṃvādabhājaḥ sahṛdayāḥ.* Criticism and poetry, in other words, appreciative sensitiveness should be harmonious with the creative genius of the poet.

The experience of delight is known as *rasaniṣpatti*. *Rasa* is delight. *Rasa* is the element of emotion in *Kāvya*. There are some feelings which are latent in every human mind and which are called *sthāyibhāvas* or permanent feelings. The feelings of love, mirth, sorrow, anger, energy, fear, disgust, astonishment and tranquility remain latent in every human mind. These feelings, when intensified due to suitable *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* become *rasa*. These nine latent impressions, mentioned above are not exhaustive. As opposed to the *sthāyī* or permanent feelings there are some transitory feelings, which are known as *sañcāri* or *vyabhicāribhāvas*. There are thirty-three *vyabhicāribhāvas*. Human mind, however, is complex. It may experience two transitory feelings at a time. It may experience many transitory feelings at a time. It may even experience the rise and pacification of a transitory feeling. Ancient Poetics has taken into consideration all these complexities of human mind. A combination of two transitory feelings is known as *bhāvasandhi*. The combination of many transitory feelings is known as *bhāvaśabalatā* and the rise and pacification of a transitory feeling are known as *bhāvodaya* and *bhāvaśānti* respectively. Even psuedo-rasas and psuedo-bhāvas are recognized and given the names *rasābhāsas* and *bhāvābhāsas* respectively. The element of emotion in *Kāvya*, therefore, is fully recognized by the Ancient Poetics. Critics have tried to explain the aesthetic experience by analysing the mental process of a reader, The *utpattivāda* of Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, the *anumitivāda* of Śrī Śaṅkuka, the *bhogikaraṇavāda* of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and the *abhivyaktivāda* of Abhinavagupta offer the solutions of *rasaniṣpatti*.

The theory of *Dhvani* is another rich contribution of Ancient Poetics. Poetry, though differing from ordinary words, does not involve a different dictionary. The words used by Vālmīki and Vyāsa, the primeval poets, do not differ from those used by Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, or other poets. How, then, is it that Kālidāsa is considered to be greater than the other poets? How, again, does poetry differ from ordinary words? The Dhvanikāra solves this problem by attributing a new function to words in poetry. This function is known as *vyañjanā* or suggestion. Words in poetry convey an extra-ordinary beautiful sense, which is distinct from the primary sense of these words. The process of suggestion enables the poet to secure economy in art, and at the same time, endows the sense with a beauty, which is rendered more striking because it is concealed. The *Dhvani* theorists adopt a very broad and generous outlook. It is true that *rasa* is the soul of *Kāvya*, but does *Kvāya* cease to be *Kāvya* when a fact or an imaginative idea is suggested by words? The *Dhvani* theorists, therefore, said that suggested sense may be threefold : *rasadhvani*, *vastudhvani* and *alaṅkāradhvani*.

Before the advent of the *Dhvani* theorists, some writers had established *alaṅkāras* as the soul of poetry, and some, *guṇas* as the soul of poetry. The Dhvanikāra did not ignore these earlier theories established by his predecessors as he had fully realized the importance of *alaṅkāras*, *guṇas* and *rītis*. He examined *alaṅkāras*, *guṇas* and *rītis* in the light of his own theory and worked out a new scheme, where all the different elements of poetry are systematically and harmoniously assigned their own places. *Alaṅkāras*, says the Dhvanikāra, are acceptable only if they from a part and parcel of the poetic expression when the poet's mind is full of emotions. *Alaṅkāras* express an idea clearly and pointedly when simple words fail to do so. An object, when described figuratively, is described along with its accessory, with which it is compared, contrasted, or associated. *Alaṅkāras* thus present two objects before our eyes and thereby give delight to our fancy. They impart a new colour to an object and shed a new light on it. But *alaṅkāras* may also mislead a poet by tempting him to enter into verbal tricks and juggleries. The Dhvanikāra, therefore, warns the poets against displaying their mastery over language by figures like *yamaka*, especially when they have to depict delicate emotions like love, sorrow or love in seperation. Only those *alaṅkāras* which do not involve a separate effort on the part of a poet when he is depicting *rasa* are allowed by the Dhvanikāra. So did he change the concept of *guṇas*. The *guṇas*, according to the Dhvanikāra are qualities, not of word and sense, but of *rasa*.

Another important contribution of the Dhvanikāra was his emphasis on propriety. In poetry, as in life, propriety is essential. A waist–

girdle, however beautifully made, arouses laughter if worn around the neck. Likewise poetry loses its grace if the poet lapses into impropriety. The centre of poetry is *rasa* and the poet has to see that the word, sense, *guṇas*, *alaṅkāras* and *ritis* are all in propriety with the *rasa*. The element of emotion in poetry is extremely delicate. It is very obvious that an arrangement of soft syllables is very appropriate to the sentiment of love, as in an idyllic image like this :

lalitalavaṅgalatāpariśīlanakomalamalayasamīre
madhukaranikarasmitakokilaguñjatkuñjakuṭire.

An arrangement of harsh syllables is conducive to the heroic sentiment as in the following :

jyājihvayā valayitotkaṭakoṭidaṃṣṭra–
mudgārighoraghanaghargharaghoṣam etat /
grāsaprasaktahasadantakavaktrayantra–
jṛmbhāviḍambivikaṭodaracāpam etat //

The *rītis*, *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras*, therefore, should befit the *rasa*. The Dhvanikāra, therefore, emphatically says that impropriety is the only cause of *rasabhaṅga* and that the secret of *rasa* lies in following the well-known tradition :

anaucityād ṛte nānyad rasabhaṅgasya kāraṇ m /
prasiddhaucityabandhas tu rasasyopaniṣat parā //

The theory of *Dhvani* and the scheme of poetry given by the Dhvanikāra were accepted by almost all his successors. Writers like Kuntaka and Mahimabhaṭṭa did not accept *Dhv..ni* and tried to refute it but Abhinavagupta defended the Dhvanikāra and strengthened the theory of *Dhvani*.

After the Dhvanikāra, Kuntaka established the *Vakrokti* theory. Though Kuntaka could not attract any followers, his contribution to Ancient Poetics cannot be underestimated. Kuntaka defined poetry as follows:

śabdārthau sahitau vakrakavivyāpāraśālini /
bandhe vyavasthitau kāvyaṃ tadvidāhlādakāriṇi //

Kuntaka is the first to mention *kavivyāpāra* in his definition of poetry. Words and sense in poetry should be an outcome of *kavivyāpāra* and should give delight to the appreciative readers. While the predecessors of Kuntaka almost ignored the poetic experience, Kuntaka brings the poet, the readers and the medium of communication between the poet and the re..der – word and sense – in his definition of poetry. The definition given by Kuntaka raises great expectations. But then Kuntaka proceeds to discuss the different *mārgas*.

The *kavivyāpāra* then, remains neglected in Ancient Poetics. Writers on Ancient Poetics are not unaware of the importance of the poet. *Pratibhā*, along with *abhyāsa* and *vyutpatti* is considered to be the cause of poetry. Rājaśekhara prescribes an elaborate time-table for the poet and describes the ideal conditions for a poet's home, his friends, etc. Vālmīki, again is traditionally described to have transformed his sorrow into verse. *Pratibhā* is defined by Bhaṭṭa Tauṭa as *prajñā nava-navonmeṣaśālinī pratibhā matā*. Abhinavagupta defines it as *apūrvavastu-nirmāṇakṣamā prajñā*. *Pratibhā* then is *prajñā*. The cause of poetry according to the ancient writers, is the intellect and not the emotion of the poet. *Vyutpatti* and *abhyāsa* are then prescribed as the catelysers of *pratibhā*. The emotional experience of the poet is totally ignored. Is the genuine *Kāvya* in *Rāmāyaṇa* the outcome of the profound emotional experience of Vālmīki, or of his intellect, sharpened by *vyutpatti* and *abhyāsa* ?

By ignoring the emotional experience of the poet, Ancient Poetics became nearly dogmatic. The nine permanent feelings and thirty-three transitory feelings do not cover all the depths and complexities of human nature. Had these permanent feelings and transitory feelings been exhaustive, the standards prescribed by Ancient Poetics should have been universal. Any work of literature, irrespective of its time, place and language then, could have been judged by applying the standards of Ancient Poetics. But these standards are not applicable to some works of literature, which are universally recognised as masterpieces of art. This dogmatism again led to the assertion that *hāsya* and *karuṇa* are contradictory *rasas* and cannot be depicted together. Some third *rasa*, which is not opposed to both these should intervene these two *rasas*. It is, however, a matter of experience that humour and pathos exist side by side in life, and so in literature.

The number of *alaṅkāras* and the divisions and subdivisions of *alaṅkāras* are other results of ignoring poetic experience. Bharata gives only four *alaṅkāras* and their number gradually increased. Jagannātha says that *pratibhā* may be acquired by *vyutpatti* and *abhyāsa*. *Pratibhā*, according to the later writers, is the imagination of the poet; an *alaṅkārakāvya*, then, is imaginative poetry as *alaṅkāras* are only *kavi-pratibhanirvartyāḥ*. The ancient writers however, have attempted to measure the immeasurable world of imagination by prescribing *alaṅkāras*. The subjective aspect of *pratibhā* is ignored, and consequently, the emotional aspect of the figures, emphasized by the Dhvanikāra is lost sight of. As only the intellectual aspect of the figures is taken into account, figures like *upamā*, *rūpaka*, *utprekṣā*, *samāsokti* and *virodha* are divided and subdivided. Some of the divisions are based purely on

grammar. The love for dogmatism is carried to its climax in the divisions of *upamā*, like *kyacgā*, *kyaṅggā*, *kartṛṇamulgā*, *karmaṇamulgā* or of *virodha* like *jātijātyoḥ virodaḥ* and *guṇaguṇayoḥ virodaḥ*. Can we say that Kālidāsa contrived a *virodha* between two actions when he said *śailādhirājatanayā na yayau na tasthau ?* The bashfulness, astonishment, love and so many indescribable feelings of Umā are expressed by Kālidāsa in the above line and he was surely not conscious of the grammatical aspect of the *virodha*, when the words came to him. Figurative language is the poet's endeavour to give an artistic shape to his emotions. Instead of describing the emotions directly, the poet conveys them through images or *alaṅkāras*.

Ancient Poetics then, with its keen sense for the good and the beautiful, ignores the poet. Poetry according to the ancient writers was more a matter of head than of heart. The dogmatism of Ancient Poetics endowed Sanskrit literature with artificiality. Poetry, for the poet, became a means for displaying mastery over language, grammar and rhetoric. Poets like Śrīharṣa, Māgha and Bhāravi concentrated their abilities on the achievement of an artificial style, and thus, subordinated their *saṃvedana* to *uktivaicitrya*.

Dr. S.G. MOGHE

VIJÑĀNEŚVARA AND NĪLAKAṆṬHA AS THE INTERPRETERS OF THE YĀJÑAVALKYA-SMṚTI

Even though it is true that Vijñāneśvara has written a commentary known as *Mitākṣarā* on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* (YS), yet it is in the nature of a digest. In his commentary, Vijñāneśvara has collected all the *smṛti* dicta available to him to arrive at a definite conclusion by removing contradiction on the basis of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā rules of interpretations framed by Jaimini. The digest of Nīlakaṇṭha, as the name suggests, also belongs to the same category, but it is voluminous as compared with the commentary *Mitākṣarā* of Vijñāneśvara on YS. In this paper an attempt is made to make a comparison between these two masters in the light of their comments from the Mīmāṃsā points of view on the verses of YS. Incidentally, it may be made clear that I am going to make casual references to the verses from the *Manu-smṛti*, on which these two masters have made their observations from the Mīmāṃsā points of view only to cite them as the authorities for my observations in this respect.

Over and above, it can be made succinctly clear that the digest of Nīlakaṇṭha does not profess to be a thorough going and critical commentary on YS. In spite of this, Nīlakaṇṭha has time and again referred to the verses of YS in the course of his discussion. In the light of this background, the comparison between these two authors is here intended.

I. There are some places in YS which are not at all touched by Vijñāneśvara in his Mīmāṃsā comments, but suggested by Nīlakaṇṭha. These are the places of YS, where Vijñāneśvara, being a profound Mīmāṃsaka, ought to have introduced Mīmāṃsā points :

While discussing the topic of the shares of members of the joint family Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from YS. II. 139 and says that in

interpreting this text, we will have to construe the expression *asaṃsṛṣṭy api ca ādadyāt* with the preceding clause *anyodaryas tu saṃsṛṣṭī*, etc., and also with the succeeding clause. Thus, the above expression serves the double purpose. Nīlakaṇṭha has used here the principle of the *Dehalī-dīpaka-nyāya.*[1] But this principle is not at all used by Vijñāneśvara in his comments on YS.

While discussing the topic of the expiation for drinking wine, Nīlakaṇṭha refers to YS. III. 254. In this verse, the expression *samāḥ niśi* occurs. Here a drinker of wine is asked to eat ground grains of rice for many years at night. The word *samāḥ* is in the plural number. The proper application of the principle of the *Kapiñjala-nyāya*, to the present case, makes it clear that a wine drinker should eat ground grains of rice for three years and not more, at night. This discussion occurs in the *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*[2] of Nīlakaṇṭha. This is a place where a careful student of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā would hope that Vijñāneśvara ought to have applied the principle of the *Kapiñjala-nyāya*. But it appears that he has not used it. Incidentally it may be pointed out that Vijñāneśvara has made use of the principle of the *Kapiñjala-nyāya* in the course of his explanation on YS. III. 30.

I here cite a few more instances where Nīlakaṇṭha has used the Mīmāṃsā points and Vijñāneśvara is silent. Nīlakaṇṭha has used the principle of *Nityānuvāda* on YS. II. 175 (202 V.M.), *Uddeśyagataṃ viśeṣaṇam avivakṣitam* on YS. II. 121 (90 V.M.), *Paryudāsa* on III. 219 (2 *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*), *Arthavāda* on III. 228, *Vācanikātideśa* on III. 231 (165 *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*), *Upalakṣaṇa* on III. 292, III. 15, *Samuccaya* on I. 280 and III. 289 (179 and 237 *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*), *Sāmyātideśa* on I. 243 (98 *Śrāddha-mayūkha*), *Parisaṃkhyā* on I. 236 (80 *Śrāddha-mayūkha*), *Kāṇḍānusamaya* on I. 231 (78 *Śrāddha-mayūkha*), *Anuvāda* on I. 85 (113 *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*), etc.

II. There are some important places of the *Mitākṣarā* on YS where a curious reader would hope to find some important Mīmāṃsā comments of Nīlakaṇṭha. But in this respect, the reader is utterly disappointed by Nīlakaṇṭha, the author of 12 *Mayūkhas*. These are the important places of YS, that are touched by Vijñāneśvara and not by Nīlakaṇṭha.

1. *atrānyodaryānyamātṛjādipadair na sāpatno bhrātaivocyate. kiṃ tu pitṛvyādir api......asaṃsṛṣṭy api iti dehalīdīpavat pūrvottarapadābhyām anveti*, YS, *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*, p. 149, Nirnaya Sagara edition, 1936.

2. *pare samā niśi iti bahuvacanāntam peṭhuḥ. tatra kapiñjalanyāyenābdatrayaṃ sambhavati*, ibid. *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*, p. 102.

Vijñāneśvara has introduced a hair-splitting discussion on YS. I. 81 as to whether this is a case of *niyama* or *parisaṃkhyā*, and after a hot debate, concludes that this is a case of *niyama*. This is a place which is not at all handled or touched by Nīlakaṇṭha at great length in his discussion. It may also be significantly pointed out here that in the *Ācāra-mayūkha* Nīlakaṇṭha casually refers to this opinion of Vijñāneśvara, without mentioning his name[3].

Vijñāneśvara in his comments on YS. I. 256, has introduced a hair-splitting discussion on the topic of the *pārvaṇa* mode of *śrāddha* and *ekoddiṣṭa* mode of *śrāddha*. This is a place where Vijñāneśvara has criticised the view points of southerners, northerners and the two other view points. Any one would have expected the comments of Nīlakaṇṭha on this technical point. But the readers are again disappointed. In order to arrive at the definite conclusion, Nīlakaṇṭha has relied on the principles of *Upasaṃhāra* and the *Vyavasthitavikalpa* in the course of his discussion.

Moreover, Vijñāneśvara has employed the principle of *Dvayoḥ praṇayanti* on YS. II. 135. Here the line under discussion is '*patnī duhitaraś caiva*' which introduces the hair-splitting discussion. Nīlakaṇṭha has not opened such discussion in his *Śrāddha-mayūkha* either to make vital suggestion in the matter or to find fault with Vijñāneśvara. It is Mitramiśra, the author of *Vīramitrodaya*, who has used the same maxim of *Dvayoḥ praṇayanti* in the discussion of his *Vyavahāraprakāśa*.

III. At times, however, Vijñāneśvara is closely followed by Nīlakaṇṭha in the course of his discussion on YS.

While discussing the topic of worship of the brahmins invited for the *śrāddha* ceremony, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a line from YS I. 231. Now the question arises whether *udakam*, *gandham*, *mālyam*, *dhūpam* and *dīpam* are to be offered to the *Daiva* and *Pitrya* brahmins by the mode of *Padārthānusamaya* or by *kāṇḍānusamaya*. Nīlakaṇṭha, however, holds that these may be offered to the brahmins, representing the manes, by the mode of *kāṇḍānusamaya*.[4] Nīlakaṇṭha further quotes a line from YS and points out that on account of the word *tataḥ*, Mādhava and

---

3. *atra pūrvārdhe kāladvayaviśiṣṭabhojanakriyāyāḥ eva niyamavidheḥ ṣoḍaśartuniśāḥ strīṇāṃ tasmin yugmāsu saṃviśet itivat*, ibid. *Ācāra-mayūkha*, p. 111.

4. *evam āsanādīn vāsontān pitrye 'pi tathaiva tān kuryāt*, ibid. *Śrāddha-mayūkha*, p. 78.

Vijñāneśvara hold that these things may be offered by the mode of *kāṇḍānusamaya*.[5]

In the course of his discussion on the *Śrāddha-mayūkha*, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from YS I. 236. This verse lays down that the *yajamāna* should bring the food mixed with ghee and ask the permission from the brahmins for offering it into the fire. In this verse, the expression *ghṛtaplutam annam* occurs. While commenting on this verse, Nīlakaṇṭha[6] quotes the opinion of the commentator of YS (i.e., Vijñāneśvara) who holds that the expression *ghṛtaplutam* indicates *parisaṃkhyā* and by this word, the other things like *śāka*, etc., are excluded. Here it is important to note that Vijñāneśvara has not used the term *parisaṃkhyā* but the sense of *parisaṃkhyā* is conveyed by his significant remark.[7]

IV. Sometimes, however, when there is a difference of opinion among the writers on the *Dharma-śāstra* on any Mīmāṃsā technical point Nīlakaṇṭha agrees with Vijñāneśvara.

While discussing the topic of *pātityahetavaḥ*, i.e., the causes of becoming outcaste, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from the *Manu-smṛti*. This verse means that if the wife of a person drinks wine, then his half body becomes *patita* (outcaste) And when his half-body has thus become *patita*, no expiation is laid down for that case. Now the question arises whether the prohibition of drinking wine is laid down with reference to the brahmin-wife of a brahmin-husband or whether with reference to a śūdra-wife of a brahmin-husband. Here Nīlakaṇṭha cites the two divergent opinions of Vijñāneśvara and Mādhava. Vijñāneśvara holds that the text is applicable to the case of a śūdra-wife of a brahmin-husband; while according to Mādhava, the prohibition *(niṣedha)*, in Manu's text refers to the brahmin-wife of a brahmin-husband. Nīlakaṇṭha, however, sides with Vijñāneśvara and rightly points out that if the interpretation as suggested by Mādhava is accepted, then there would arise the contingency of the statement being redundant. And there would be one more difficulty in dissolving the expression *patitārddhaśarīrasya* as the *bahuvrīhi* compound. Thus, this is a case of *niṣedha* in the case of drinking wine by a śūdra-wife of a brahmin-husband. Here it is pertinent to note that both Mādhava and Vijñāneśvara treat the text of Manu as indicative of *niṣedha* but interpret the same rather differently.

---

5. *atra tataḥ ity anena vaiśvadevikapadārthakāṇḍottaram pitryarcanavidhānāt kāṇḍānusamayo gamyata iti mādhavavijñāneśvarādayaḥ*, ibid.
6. *ghṛtapadena śākādi pārisaṃkhyeti vijñāneśvaraḥ*. ibid. p. 80.
7. *ghṛtagrahaṇaṃ sūpaśākādi nivṛttyartham*, ibid.

But Nīlakaṇṭha agrees with Vijñāneśvara in his discussion in the *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*.[8]

V. Very often does Nīlakaṇṭha disagree with Vijñāneśvara on some Mīmāṃsā technical points and expressly criticizes the view point of the latter.

While discussing the topic of succession to the property of a reunited member of the joint Hindu family, Nīlakaṇṭha refers to the view point of Vijñāneśvara who understands the line *saṃsṛṣṭinas tu saṃsṛṣṭi*, etc., of YS. II. 138 by making the *anuṣaṅga* of the words *svaryātasya* and *aputrasya* occurring in YS. II. 135. Nīlakaṇṭha does not agree with Vijñāneśvara and holds that this is not a fit case of *anuṣaṅga* inasmuch as even without making the *anuṣaṅga* of the words, the required results can be obtained. On the contrary, if we resort to *anuṣaṅga* the following absurd results would follow. If *aputrasya* is connected as applied, then the result would be that of two sons or a son and a grandson, one of whom is reunited with the father, and the other is not reunited both will be entitled to the same share on their father's death. And this verse will have no application to a deceased reunited member who dies leaving sons. And this would be opposed to popular usage. Besides, the required results can be obtained by referring to the text of Vṛddha Manu in respect of *svaryātasya* and secondly by referring to the latter part of the stanza in respect of *aputrasya*. This discussion takes place in the *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*.[9]

Over and above, while discussing the topic of the line of succession to the property of a deceased person, Nīlakaṇṭha refers to YS. II. 135. In this verse, the word *bhrātaraḥ* occurs. Vijñāneśvara understands the word *bhrātā* in two senses: 1) full-brother and 2) half-brother. According to Vijñāneśvara, the full-brother will succeed to the property of a deceased person. And in his default, the half-brother would succeed. The above mode of interpretation as suggested by Vijñāneśvara, will involve the serious fault of *Vṛttidvayavirodha* according to Nīlakaṇṭha. This discussion takes place in the *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*.[10]

---

8. *dvijātibhāryāyāḥ śūdrāyāḥ surāpānaniṣedhārtham idam iti vijñāneśvaraḥ. mādhavas tu brāhmaṇyādīnām apy ayaṃ niṣedhaḥ...........ato vijñāneśvara eva samyag ūce*, ibid, *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*, p. 63.

9. *saṃsṛṣṭinas tu saṃsṛṣṭī sodarasya tu sodaraḥ.... ....tena vināpi gatau sambhavantyām anuṣaṅge mānābhāvāt*, ibid. *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*, p. 147.

10. *mātur abhāve bhrātā sodaraḥ. tadabhāve tatputraḥ...........ca gauṇyā vṛttidvayavirodhāt*, ibid. p. 142.

Moreover, Nīlakaṇṭha does not agree with Vijñāneśvara in interpreting the text of Manu IX. 192, whether the sons and daughters – together succeed to the estate of a deceased woman *(strīdhana)*. Here, according to Vijñāneśvara *sāhitya* togetherness (close contiguity) is not intended. But Nīlakaṇṭha quotes the view point of the *Dāyabhāga* school that *sāhitya* is intended between the sons and daughters that succeed to the estate of a deceased woman. This discussion takes place in the *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*.[11]

VI. At times, however, on one and the same Mīmāṃsā technical point, both the authors are diametrically opposed to each other.

While interpreting the text of YS. I. 53, Vijñāneśvara suggests that the prohibition of the marriage with a sickly girl is a case of *puruṣārtha*. While Nīlakaṇṭha thinks that this is a case of *kratvartha*[12] and if violating the rule of YS, the marriage takes place, then the man concerned suffers not only from the seen results but also from the unseen results.

While discussing the topic of adoption, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from Manu IX. 168, in which it is laid down that the son should be given in adoption by the parents, when the adopting person is in distress. The word, *āpad* occurring in it, indicates that this is a case of *puruṣārtha* according to Vijñāneśvara. Vijñāneśvara further holds that the prohibition as regards *anāpadī dattakadāna*, affects only the giver and not the receiver. As opposed to this, Nīlakaṇṭha holds that the prohibition as regards *anāpadī dattakadāna* (i.e., when the adopting person is not in distress) is a case of *kratvartha*.[13] If violating the rule of Manu, the adoption takes place, then it will become vitiated. This discussion takes place in the *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*. According to Nīlakaṇṭha, Vijñāneśvara is wrong in holding the view that *anāpadī dattakadāna* is a case of *puruṣārtha*. Likewise, Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha are diametrically opposed to each other on so many other points.

VII. At times, we fail to understand the name of the persons whose openion, both Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha are trying to refer when they employ the words *iti eke* and *anye*, etc.

---

11. *yatra duhitrādy abhāvena putrāṇām eva sāhityenādhikāraḥ............ sāhityaṃ vidhīyate iti āhuḥ*, ibid. p. 158.

12. *yad api vivāhaprakaraṇe tenaivoktaṃ..............dānavidhāyakatvābhāvāt*, ibid. p. 108.

13. *yad api niṣedho dātur eva puruṣārtho na kratvarthaḥ iti vijñāneśvaraḥ tan na*, ibid. p. 107.

In his commentary on YS. I. 103, Vijñāneśvara refers to the opinion of some[14] whom he is trying to criticize. Dr. P.S. Sane suggests that these are the view points of the *Smṛtyarthasāra* and *Laghu-Āśvalāyana*. In the course of his discussion in the *Prāyaścittamayūkha*, when the topic of expiation to be performed by a woman leading immoral life was under consideration, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from Manu and says that whatever is the expiation laid down for men approaching the women of other castes is laid down, the same is to be extended to the case of women leading immoral life. According to some writers[15] on the *Dharma-śāstra*, even though this is a fit case of *Vācanikātideśa*, yet the expiation which a woman is required to perform should be less by one quarter of the expiation a man is required to observe. Here Nīlakaṇṭha does not state the name of the person whom he is referring to. We get another example of this kind in the discussion on the *Samaya-mayūkha*, p. 187.

VIII. At times, after citing the two divergent opinions on the matter under discussion Nīlakaṇṭha passes over the point in silence. But we do not come accross such a case in the scholarly commentary of Vijñāneśvara on YS.

In the course of his discussion on the topic of expiation to be performed by a man in the case of his eating impure things of his body, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes a verse from Manu V. 134, which states that the second thread ceremony is necessary. Now the important question is whether this is an independent expiation or whether it is to be combined with the other expiation. Here Nīlakaṇṭha cites the two divergent opinions of Śūlapāṇi and others. Śūlapāṇi holds that the second thread ceremony is to be combined with the other expiations; while others hold that this is an independent expiation. Here Nīlakaṇṭha passes over this point in silence. This discussion takes place in the *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*.[16] We get another example of this variety in the discussion on the *Samaya-mayūkha*, p. 187.

IX. Some times, however, on some technical Mīmāṃsā point, Nīlakaṇṭha agrees virtually with Vijñāneśvara, though the former has

14. *iha kecid vaiśvadevākhyasya karmaṇaḥ puruṣārthatvam annasaṃskārakarmatvaṃ cecchanti..............parasparavirodhāt puruṣārthatvam eva yuktam*, ibid. p. 33.

15. *etac ca vācanikātideśāt pādonam iti kecit. pūrṇam eva tu yuktam*, ibid. *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*, p. 165.

16. *punaḥ saṃskāraḥ punar upanayanam. idaṃ ca prātisvikaiḥ śarīramalabhakṣaṇaprāyaścittaiḥ samuccīyata iti śūlapāṇiḥ svatantram eva prāyaścittam ity anye*, ibid. p. 114.

not employed one and the same Mīmāṃsā principle to arrive at a definite conclusion on the point at issue.

This point can be illustrated by pointing that Vijñāneśvara in his commentary on YS. I. 103, holds that the *Vaiśvadeva* rite is meant for the beneficial interest of men. It is a case of *puruṣārtha*[17] and not of *kratvaratha.* Vijñāneśvara holds that had the *Vaiśvadeva* rite been a case of *kratvartha,* then for every additional cooking, the performance of the *Vaiśvadeva* rite would have become necessary. But this is not the case.

In his discussion on the *Ācāra-mayūkha,* while discussing the performance of five great sacrifices, Nīlakaṇṭha points out the principle[18] that *Pratipradhānaṃ guṇāvṛttiḥ* is inapplicable to the repetition of the *Vaiśvadeva* rite for every additional fresh cooking. Here it appears that Nīlakaṇṭha also sides with Vijñāneśvara in holding that the performance of the *Vaiśvadeva* rite is for the beneficial interest of men. It is important to note that the two authors have not used one and the same principle. Vijñāneśvara has used the Mīmāṃsā principle of *kratvartha* and *puruṣārtha* and Nīlakaṇṭha has applied the doctrine of *pratipradhānaṃ guṇāvṛttiḥ* to show that the repitition of the *Vaiśvadeva* rite is not necessary.

X. Both the authors go to the root of the subject of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā and make their valuable comments on the Mīmāṃsā technical points that occur in the course of their discussion.

Vijñāneśvara in his commentary on YS. I. 256, introduces a discussion on the Mīmāṃsā technical term *upasaṃhāra* and also takes pretty care to give the proper illustration of the term *upasaṃhāra.*[19] Nīlakaṇṭha also in his discussion on the *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha* throws a flood of light on the technical terms *prasaṅga,* and *tantratā*[21] It seems proper

17. *athātaḥ pañcayajñāḥ* (Gṛ. Sū. 3. 1. 1) *ity upakramya 'tān etān yajñān aharahaḥ kurvīta* (3. 1. 4) *iti niyatatvābhidhānāt puruṣārthatvaṃ cāvagamyate iti..........* *puruṣārthatve vaiśvadevakarmārthatā dravyasyeti parasparāvirodhāt puruṣārthatvam eva yuktam,* ibid. p. 33.

18. *na ca pratiprathānaṃ guṇāvṛttiḥ iti nyāyāt pratipākaṃ tadāvṛttiḥ syāt. sandhyāvandanādivad avibhaktānām pṛthag anuṣṭhānāṃ na syād iti vācyam,* ibid. *Ācāra-mayūkha,* p. 69.

19. *yathā saptadaśasāmidhenīr anubrūyād ity anārabhyādhītasya vikṛtimātraviṣayasya... ....sambandhabodhanārthavatā upasaṃhāraḥ,* ibid. p. 84.

20. *tatra viśeṣagrahaṇe sakṛd anuṣṭhānam prasaṅgaḥ,* ibid, *Prāyaścitta-muyūkha,* p. 13.

21. *atra deśakālakartrādīnām aikye karmaṇo 'neka prayogaviṣayiṇīnyāyena prāptāpi tantratāvibhaktakartṛbhede 'pi vacanena bodhyate,* ibid. *Vyavahāra-mayūkha,* p. 133.

to note here that whatever light Nīlakaṇṭha has thrown on the Mīmāṃsā technical terms in the course of his discussion is not intended strictly while commenting on the verses of YS or the *Manu-smṛti*.

XI. Being bred in an atmosphere redolent with the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā system, Vijñāneśvara very minutely, detects the flaw in the argument of the opponent and also in the illustration cited by the opponent and at the same time shows his ability to give a proper illustration of the technical point under discussion. Though Nīlakaṇṭha, is also sufficiently clever enough to detect the flaw in the argument of the opponent, he does not always cite the fitting or proper example of the Mīmāṃsā point at issue. This can be well illustrated by pointing out the illustration of the commentary of Vijñāneśvara on YS. I. 81, regarding the point and illustration of *Vidhyanuvādavirodha*.[22] This point can be further clarified by referring to the commentary of Vijñāneśvara when he takes good care to point out the opponent the proper example of the conflict between the text of *Arthaśāstra* and the *Dharma-śāstra*.[23] In the case of Nīlakāṇṭha, it may be simply noted that he will not enter into the hair-splitting discussion of the topic but remain contended with citing or pointing out the flaw in the argument of Vijñāneśvara on the ground of *Vṛttidvayavirodha, Vākyabheda*, etc., and will not show the acuteness of intellect by citing the proper example of the point under consideration.

XII. Vijñāneśvara has largely influenced Haradatta who in his turn has influenced Nīlakaṇṭha in this field.

Vijñāneśvara in his commentary on YS. III. 265 has suggested that there should be the deduction of something from the original case (*prakṛti*) to the extended case (*vikṛti*), when the details of the *prakṛti* are transferred to the *vikṛti* by the rule of transfer (*atideśa*).[24] Haradatta in his commentary on the *Āpastamba-dharma-sūtra* I. 8. 26. 5, suggests that in the extended case (*vikṛti*) one half of the original (*prakṛti*) should be adopted following the principle of the *Smārta-nyāya*.[25] Nīlakaṇṭha has borne this principle in mind and utilised it properly in his discussion on the *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha* by introducing the three varieties of *atideśa* –

---

22. *tatra hi vidhyanuvādavirodho yatra vidheyāvadhitayā tad evānuvāditavyaṃ .... phaloddeśena vidhātavyaś ceti*, ibid, 23.

23. *hiraṇyabhūmilābhebhyo mitralabdhir varā yata............balavat*, ibid. p. 133.

24. *atrātideśasāmarthyād gocarmavasanagoparicaryādibhir gauṇavadhāsūdhāraṇiaḥ katipayair nyūnatvam avagamyate*, ibid. p. 423.

25. *atideśeṣu cārdhaṃ prāpyata iti smārto nyāyas tena strīṇām ardhaprāptyartha ṃ vacanam iti, Āpastamba-dharma-sūtra*, p. 146.

vācanika, *tādrūpya* and *sāmya*. This evolution of the idea of deducing something from the original case to the extended case is to be borne in mind by a careful student of the works of Nīlakaṇṭha, Vijñāneśvara and Haradatta.

XIII. In his exposition of the topic, Vijñāneśvara is always very succinct and clear and easy to follow. But at times, we do not get clear cut idea about the view point of Nīlakaṇṭha. In fact, Nīlakaṇṭha tries to confuse us in the matter under discussion.

This point can be clarified by citing the example from the *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*. While discussing the topic of adoption, Nīlakaṇṭha quotes Manu IX. 168 and does not clarify his position as to whether the giving of the son in adoption when the adopting person is not in distress is a case of *puruṣārtha* or *kratvartha* and whether any sin (*pratyavāya*) would incur by violating the rule laid down by the text of Manu.[27]

Conclusion: One will have to admit that Nīlakaṇṭha has suggested the Mīmāṃsā points on those places of YS that are not at all handled by Vijñāneśvara. Also there are some important places of the *Mitākṣarā* on YS, where a curious reader of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā would hope to find some new point of view of the author of twelve *Mayūkhas*. But in this respect, it is evident, that the readers are disappointed by Nīlakaṇṭha. Vijñāneśvara is closely followed by Nīlakaṇṭha in his discussion on the *Mayūkhas*. At times, however, when there is a difference of opinion among the writers on the *Dharma-śāstra* on one and the same Mīmāṃsā technical point, Nīlakaṇṭha agrees well with Vijñāneśvara. Nīlakaṇṭha is bold enough to show his difference of opinion with Vijñāneśvara on some of the technical points of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā; in fact Nīlakaṇṭha is diametrically opposed to Vijñāneśvara. Very often does Nīlakaṇṭha criticize the author of the *Mitākṣarā* on some of the technical Mīmāṃsā points. Sometimes, however, the readers are unable to make out whose opinion these two authors are trying to refer to. This is due to the fact that both the authors in the course of their discussion, make a reference to the other writers on the *Dharma-śāstra* with the expression *iti eke* or *iti anye*. At times, after citing the two divergent opinions on one and the same point under discussion, Nīlakaṇṭha passes

---

26. *atra sāmyātideśe 'rdhaṃ, tādrūpyavācanikayos tu pādonam*, YS. *Prāyaścitta-mayūkha*, p. 14.

27. *asya vākyād adṛṣṭārthatayā kratvarthatvāvagamāt. kathañcid dṛṣṭārthatve 'pi va niyamādṛṣṭasya āvasyakatvān na tadatikrame kāryaviśeṣaprayojakādṛṣṭasiddhih..............āpadt putradāne pratyavāyāpaitiḥ*, ibid, *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*, pp. 107-8.

over the point in silence. But Vijñāneśvara is not found to have indulged in such things. Sometimes, however, it can be easily noticed by a careful reader that though Nīlakaṇṭha virtually agrees with Vijñāneśvara on some of the Mīmāṃsā technical points yet he does not use the same technical term used by Vijñāneśvara in the course of his discussion. Both the authors go to the root of the subject of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā and offer their own comments on the Mīmāṃsā technical points. Vijñāneśvara, at times, shows more acuteness and minuteness of intellect in finding fault with the argument and illustration of the opponent and at the same time takes care to substitute the proper Mīmāṃsā example of the point at issue. A careful student of the comparative study of Vijñāneśvara, Haradatta and Nīlakaṇṭha will not fail to note the evolution of the technical term *atideśa* and its due application as done by these authors to the domain of the *Dharma-śāstra*. Lastly one will have to make a note of the point that Nīlakaṇṭha is not as clear and explicit as Vijñāneśvara is in the matter of exposition of the topic under discussion. In a nutshell, the utility and supreme importance of Vijñāneśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha for a proper understanding of YS from the Mīmāṃsā point of view can hardly be gainsaid taking into account the relative greatness and superiority and inferiority of both these masters in different aspects as revealed above.

Dr. J. CHENNA REDDY

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF YAJÑAPHALANĀṬAKA*

It is in 1912 that Mahāmahopādhyāya Ganapati Sastri brought to light and published for the first time thirteen Sanskrit plays under 'Trivandrum Sanskrit Series' and ascribed all of them to Bhāsa, though in none of them the name of the author was mentioned. To substantiate his decision he has enumerated with sufficient explanatory notes, many common features that are present in all those plays. Some of them are the following :

1) Every play begins with the words *nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāraḥ*.
2) In majority of the plays the *Nāndi-śloka* contains *mudrālaṅkāra*.
3) The word *sthāpanā* is used invariably for *prastāvanā* and every one of them is unusually brief and short.
4) The expression *'evam āryamiśrān vijñāpayāmi; aye! kiṃ nu khalu mayi vijñāpanavyagre śabda iva śrūyate, aṅga! paśyāmi'* immediately follows the *Nāndi* in all the plays.
5) The name Rājasiṃha occurs in the *bharatavākya* of almost all the plays and even that *bharatavākya* is almost the same in all the plays.
6) The twin words *niṣkramya* and *praviśya* are frequently used to denote the exit and the entrance respectively of a character without allowing reasonable interval between the two expressions.
7) The name of the *pratihārī* is Vijayā in all the plays.

*A paper read in the All-India Oriental Conference – Twentyfifth (Silver Jubilee) Session at Jadavpur University, Calcutta, on 31-10-1969.

8) The non–observance of the rules of grammar as prescribed by Pāṇini or the rules of dramaturgy formulated by sage Bharata is noticed very often.

Many of the above common features have been recognised by Bāṇa and some other poets as to pertain to the plays of Bhāsa. Some of the verses quoted as examples in authoritative works on poetics ascribing them to Bhāsa by the authors of those works are identified in one or two of the plays of this group. So M. M. Ganapati Sastri has rightly ascribed all the thirteen plays to Bhāsa which group is commonly known as *Bhāsanāṭakacakra*.

The plays forming *Bhāsanāṭakacakra* are the following :

I. *Pratimā* and *Abhiṣeka* – based on *Rāmāyaṇa* story,

II. a) *Madhyamavyāyoga*, *Pañcarātram*, *Dūtavākyam*, *Dūtaghaṭotkacam*, *Karṇabhāram* and *Ūrubhaṅgam* based on *Mahābhārata* story which group includes

b) *Bālacaritam* also as it is based on *Harivaṃśa* – a *khilabhāga* (appendage) of *Mahābhārata*,

III. *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam*, *Svapnavāsavadattam* and *Avimārakam* based on *(Bṛhat) Kathā* literature which is a combination of history and legend, and

IV. *Cārudattam* – an incomplete play with a social theme of Bhāsa's creation.

In 1941, Sri Rajavaidya Jivarama Kalidasa Sastri from Gondal published a play entitled *Yajñaphala* in Sanskrit ascribing it to Bhāsa. He has given in his introduction four epithets to substantiate Bhasa's authorship of the play. They are

1. *bhāṣāyā atiprācīnasaṃskṛtatvāt*, 2. *vastukalpanāyāḥ śreṣṭhatvāt*, 3. *rasabhāvālaṅkāranāṭyāṅgānām manoharatamatvāt*, and 4. *bāṇādivarṇitānekasāmānyabhāsanāṭaka–saṃvāditvāc ca*

curiously enough this play possesses almost all the features which M.M. Ganapati Sastri enumerated as common features to Bhāsa's plays.

Yajñaphala is based on *Rāmāyaṇa* story. It contains the story of Śrīrāma upto his marriage with Sītā. The after effects or the results of three *yajñas* (sacrifices) play very important role in this play. The birth of Śrīrāma is the result of the *yajña* of Daśaratha, the acquisition of celestial *(divya)* weapons by Śrīrāma and Lakṣmaṇa is the result of the *yajña* of Viśvāmitra and the visit of Śrīrāma to Mithila leading to his marriage with Sītā is the result of the *yajña* of Janaka. Hence the

play is named *Yajñaphala* having these facts in mind. Even the play *Abhiṣeka* is named only on this principle. That play has three important events, i.e. the three *abhiṣekas*, namely 1) the *abhiṣeka* of Sugrīva to the kingdom of Kiṣkindha, 2) the *abhiṣeka* of Vibhīṣaṇa to the kingdom of Laṅka and 3) the *abhiṣeka* of Śrīrāma to the kingdom of Kosala (Ayodhya). All the above features in *Yajñaphala* make one believe that the play is really written by Bhāsa. By looking at the play only superficially, great scholars like Dr. Pusalkar from Poona (in chapter VI of *Bhāsa – A study* and S. N. Sinha from Bangalore (in Introduction to *Pañcarātram)* subscribed to the findings of Sri Kalidasa Sastri. But on close examination one can very easily repudiate the authorship of *Yajñaphala* as ascribed to Bhāsa. Dr. Pusalkar published his revised opinion in this regard in his recent article.

Pratimā contains the story covering *Ayodhyā, Araṇya* and *Yuddha kāṇḍas* of *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa* and *Abhiṣeka* contains the story of *Kiṣkindha* and *Sundara kāṇḍas*. So in the *Rāmāyaṇa* plays of *Bhāsanāṭaka-cakra*, only the story of *Bāla-khāṇḍa* of *Vālmīki–Rāmāyaṇa* remains untouched by Bhāsa. Hence it is believed that birth of *Yajñaphalanāṭaka* is to fill up that gap in the *Rāmāyaṇa* story. Now let us examine whether Bhāsa himself wrote that play or somebody else did it.

Yajñaphala contains seven acts. In, act I Daśaratha performs *yajña* and begets four sons as a result. He celebrates the birth of his sons in a fitting manner and takes a vow to bestow special care on their education. He decides to meet his wives in a garden at midnoon of next day. In act II, Daśaratha meets his wives as indicated in the previous act and consults them how best he can select a successor to the throne. In a strategic way he makes Kaikeyī herself to propose Śrīrāma as heir apparent. But Vidūṣaka in his customary blab indicates future calamity through Kaikeyī's trecherous plan. In act III, Rāvaṇa visits Ayodhyā in order to assess the physical strength of Śrīrāma. At the same time Viśvāmitra also comes to Ayodhyā to request King Daśaratha to depute Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa along with him to protect his *yajña* from the onslaughts of Rākṣasas. Mantharā decides to poison the mind of Kaikeyī against Śrīrāma's prospects. In Act IV, Viśvāmitra obtains permission of Daśaratha to take Śrīrāma and Laksmaṇa with him. In Act V, Tāṭakā and Subāhu were slain and Mārīca is flung afar into an ocean. The sacrifice end sauspiciously, Śrīrāma and Lakṣmaṇa are presented with rare and divine weapons (*astras*) by Viśvāmitra. On the pretext of witnessing the *yajña* of Janaka, Viśvāmitra takes Śrīrāma and Lakṣmaṇa to Mithila. In Act VI, Śrīrāma and Sītā are made to meet in a garden only to fall in love with each other at first sight. Janaka decides upon the marriages of his daughters with the visiting princes and extends

invitation to Daśaratha. In Act VII, the marriages of four princes were performed. The pride of Paraśurāma is brought down and the play ends.

I strongly believe that some poet of mediaeval times has taken fancy to write *Yajñaphala-nāṭaka* incorporating the story of *Bāla-kāṇḍa* and to circulate it in the name of Bhāsa only to make scholars believe that Bhāsa has dramatised entire *Rāmāyaṇa*. The episode of Pandita Gopala Datta Sastri of Jaipur as narrated by Prof. R.N. Dandekar in his article '*Authorship of Yajñaphala*' published in vol. XXXI (1950) of *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Poona, is a monumental example of such a possibility. He might have taken advantage of or inspiration from a *śloka* quoted by Viśvanātha as an example to *vidhāna*, an aspect of *mukhasandhi* under *kārikā* 85 in the sixth *Pariccheda* of *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* and ascribed it to Bhāsa. The *śloka* reads thus —

utsāhātiśayaṃ vatsa! tava bālyaṃ ca paśyataḥ |
mama harṣaviṣādābhyāṃ ākrāntaṃ yugapan manaḥ. ||

The context of this verse is supposed to be from a scene wherein Paraśurāma and Srīrāma meet in Mithila. This gives an impression that Bhāsa has also written a play incorporating the story of *Bāla-kāṇḍa* of *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa*. This *śloka* might have been in circulation even before Viśvanātha quoted it.

The following are the verses in *Yajñaphala* which were stale imitations to Kālidāsa's verses. Any scholar possessing an average critical outlook will detect this fact. I do not hesitate to go a step further and proclaim that the author of *Yajñaphala* has artificially created these situations only to find an opportunity to compose the verses in imitation to Kālidāsa's verses. Only a few examples I am giving hereunder :

1) Sumantra says at the time of celebrating the birth day of the princes

samrāḍ eva sutodayena vihito muktaḥ pitṝṇām ṛṇāt |
paitryād ṛṇād āsa bhavān nibaddho mokṣas tato 'bhūd bhavatas tu tasmāt || Yajña. I

This expression is an imitation to the following verse of Kālidāsa on the birth of Raghu

na saṃyutas tasya babhūva rakṣitur
visarjayed yaṃ sutajanmaharṣitaḥ |
ṛṇābhidhānāt svayam eva kevalaṃ
tadā pitṝṇām mumuce sa bandhanāt || Raghu. III. 20.

2) Daśaratha says to Vidūṣaka

kva nṛpatvam analpaviplavaṃ kva kumārāḥ sukumāracetasaḥ /
parihāsavijalpitaṃ tv idam paramārthaṃ na hi manyatāṃ vacaḥ //
Yajña. II. 41.

This verse is an imitation to Kālidāsa's verse

kva vayaṃ kva parokṣamanmathaḥ mṛgaśābais samam edhito janaḥ /
parihāsavijalpitaṃ sakhe paramārthena na gṛhyatāṃ vacaḥ //
Śak. II. 18.

3) Bharata prays to Śrīrāma to desist from aiming an arrow at a tree

na khalu na khalu vadhyāḥ pakṣiṇo 'nāgasas te
saha pṛthukakalatraiḥ tatra vāsaḥ kṛtas taiḥ /
kva bata vihagadehāś cañcalā lāghavena
kva punar aśanikalpā mṛtyudūtāś śarās te // Yajña. III. 38.

This is also an imitation to Kālidāsa's verse

na khalu na khalu bāṇas saṃnipātyo 'yam asmin
mṛduni mṛgaśarīre puṣparāśāv ivāgniḥ /
kva bata hariṇakānāṃ jīvitaṃ cātilolaṃ
kva ca niśitanipātā vajrasārāś śarās te // Śāk. I. 10.

4) Śrīrāma thinks within himself on seeing Sītā in a garden

naivāgamyā na duṣprāpā yanmano me 'tra dhāvati /
kṛtyākṛtyaviveke tu pramāṇaṃ hi satām manaḥ // Yajña. VI. 18.

This is also an imitation to Kālidāsa's verse

asaṃśayaṃ kṣatraparigrahakṣamā
yad āryam asyām abhilāṣi me manaḥ /
satāṃ hi sandehapadeṣu vastuṣu
pramāṇam antaḥkaraṇapravṛttayaḥ // Śāk. I. 20.

All the above references to Kālidāsa are famous ones. So I have not further explained them. There are instances where other famous poets also are imitated. For want of time and space I have not quoted them. Kālidāsa himself stated in his *Mālavikāgnimitra* that Bhāsa is his predecessor. But yet it is ridiculous to try to argue that Kālidāsa himself might have imitated verses from *Yajñaphala*.

Let us now examine one by one, the four epithets used by Sri Kalidasa Sastri to prove that *Yajñaphala* is written by Bhāsa. The first one is *bhāṣāyā atiprācinasaṃskṛtatvāt*. He did not give sufficient examples which are capable of proving this statement. Instance of non-observance

of rules of Pāṇini may be shown in *mahārājñcḥ* (p. 23, line 6) and *mahārājānam* (p. 23, line 9) in the place of *mahārājasya* and *mahārājam* respectively. But in the same play, the words *mahārājasya* and *mahārājam* the correct forms are used many a time. Kaikeyī addressed Dhśaratha as *āryaputra (ajjautta* p. 39, line 9). It may appear as a violation of rule of Bharata for, Daśaratha was not a youth *(yuvā)*. But it is artificial. Similar expressions are not used in other plays ascribed to Bhāsa. However, to introduce wilfully, some constructions against the *sūtras* of grammar of Pāṇini and some technical terms against the rules of dramaturgy of Bharata is not difficult for a veteran poet.

The second statement is *vastukalpanāyāḥ śreṣṭhatvāt.* I see no *śreṣṭhatva* at all in his *vastukalpanā*. Let us examine some such instances of development of plot.

1. The celebration of birth day of Śrīrāma and other princes is described as if the very day of birth is celebrated and not that of sixteenth birth day as it should be according to the plot. The following expressions of Sumantra and Vidūṣaka in Act I justify this conjecture.

'samrāḍ eva sutodayena vihito muktcḥ pitṛṇām ṛṇāt /
paitryād ṛṇād āsa bhavān nibaddho mokṣas tato 'bhūd
bhavatas tu tasmāt //'
'kiṃ putrajanmanā tvam bubhukṣām api vismāritaḥ'.

2. The three queens express their desire to meet their husband Daśaratha. On this occasion, Kausalyā says, "*ahaṃ jyeṣṭhā; pūrvaṃ sambhāvayitavyā*". Sumitrā says, "*ahaṃ dvaycḥ k' mārayɩḥ jananī; pūrvaṃ sambhāvayitavyā*" and Kaikeyī says, "*ahaṃ eva pūrvaṃ sambhāvayitavyā.*" These expressions of the three queens are not worthy of their position and the reverence we have for them. Even if we accept this, in the case of Kaikeyī for the sake of argument, it cannot be thought of as regards the other two queens. Daśaratha describes Kausalyā as *jyeṣṭha'āvāpramānā, vismṛtānyārhaṇā, katham api gurudehaṃ cālayanti. sagarvā* (II. 16). Can anybody imagine that a great poet like Bhāsa would feel pleased to make Daśaratha describe Kausalyā in that manner ? It is more ridiculing her than praising. So also to Ś īrāma's trials on archery have been rendered an object of ridicule wherein *apratihatatva* of *śrīrāma-bāṇa* is completely smashed.

3. The entire act II in *Yajñaphala* is unsuited to the story. In a play in which the plot ends with the marriage of Śrīrāma, there should not be any prominent reference to naming a successor to the throne, or, to any evil advice by Mantharā to Kaikeyī – which material could not

be made use of in the development of the later story. Mantharā's words *na bahu manyate mama devīm* are totally irrelevant.

4. In the beginning of act V, Tāmyāyana ridicules his teacher and the very institution of *Gurukulavāsa*. This is unbecoming of Bhāsa. Any critic knowing the regard that Bhāsa had for the ancient *Ṛṣis* and the institutions they had established cannot tolerate this.

5. There are instances where the author of this play intended to declare Bharata to be an elder brother to Lakṣmaṇa. The order of the marriages in Act VII indicates that. But Bhāsa has clearly described in *Pratimā* that Lakṣmaṇa is elder to Bharata, though it is against Vālmīki. The author of *Pratimā* cannot try to contradict his own statement in *Yajñaphala*.

6. Even in manoeuvering the marriage of Śrīrāma with Sītā, it is not done in a dignified manner. It is only in the mediaeval ages that bride and bridegroom were made to meet and express their love to each other. Even in the *Purāṇa* age, such instances were very rare as in the case of Subhadrā and Arjuna or of Nala and Damayantī. But, as we believe that Śrīrāma and Sītā are the incarnations of Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī respectively, pre-arrangement to meet each other is unworthy of a poet of Bhāsa's stature. Even the meeting of Śrīrāma and Sītā in a garden is planned in a most indecent manner. The conversation among Muṣṭika, Sthūlaṃsa and Dīrghabāhu reveals that Janaka and Viśvāmitra wilfully arranged their meeting in a garden. When Muṣṭika asked '*kim mahārājo viśvāmitraś ca jānīta etat ?*' Dīrghabāhu replies '*jānītaḥ. ata eva tayor ekānte darśanam anumatam bhavet*'. Can anybody appreciate this type of treatment in such a ceremonial scene? The situation created for Śrīrāma to meet Sītā is also an imitation to Duṣyanta's meeting with Śakuntalā. The conversation between Sītā and Madhurikā justifies this idea.

The third statement is *rasabhāvālaṅkāranāṭyāṅgānām manoharatamatvāt*. This play ends with the marriage of Śrīrāma with Sītā. So it is clear that the author intended to introduce *śṛṅgāra-rasa*. But it is not properly developed. Act VI, is the only act that helps the development of *śṛṅgāra*, but the plot and its treatment cannot be of Bhāsa's creation as already described. All the supposed good features are mere imitations of Kālidāsa and others. So there is no *manoharatamatva* of anything worth to name in the play.

The fourth statement is *bāṇādivarṇitānekasāmānyabhāsanāṭakasaṃvāditvāt*. This is not difficult for a poet even of average capacity to create such *saṃvādas* in a play when one intends to do so.

So I conclude that Bhāsa is not the author of the play *Yajñaphala* or in other words the author who wrote all the thirteen plays ascribed to Bhāsa has not written *Yajñaphala*.

Dr. SIDDHESWAR VARMA

OBJECT - PHILOSOPHICAL AND GRAMMATICAL - IN SANSKRIT TRADITION

I. Introductory

Philosophy and grammar are so closely intertwined with each other in Sanskrit tradition, that it often becomes problematic to dissociate them. Later Sanskrit immensely adopted Sanskrit philosophical terminology, so that sometimes contexts turn up in which there occurs a riddle as to the exact nature of the subject – philosophy or grammar.

II. 'Object' in Modern Philosophical Contexts

The term object in modern philosophical contexts is generally used for 'that in which the activity of the mind ends or towards which it is directed'[1]. In Sanskrit philosophical spheres the trend is to use the object in the latter sense - the direction of the mind may be to any line of mental activity, but not to a satisfaction which may be equivalent to the end of that activity.

III. 'Object' in Sanskrit Philosophical Tradition

Sanskrit tradition reveals a vast range of gradation in the concept of 'object'. The most common term used in Sanskrit philosophical circles for 'object' is *viṣaya;* Gotama, in his *Nyāya-sūtras* in one context[2]; uses it in the sense of sensuous object, being used with reference to its fixed relarionship with individual senses, while in another context[3] he uses this term in relation to the totality of senses. The *Sāṃkhya-tattava-kaumudī*[4] uses it in the sense of 'topical description', the 'objects

1. *Encyclopaedia Britanica*, p. 668 (1940).
2. *na viṣayavyavasthānāt*, *Nyāyasūtra* of Gotama, 3.1.2, ed. Vidyabhushan, Allahabad, 1930.
3. *viṣayatvāvyatirekād ekatvam*, ibid. 3.1.59.

being those which, by their diverse forms, make a subject presentable'. This means that the range of 'object' was not confined to the senses, but extended to any sphere entitled to description.

IV. 'Object' in the sense of Philosophical Validity

In his introduction to the first aphorism[5] of Gotama, Vātsyāyana uses Gotama's term *prameya* the sense of which is 'philosopical validity'. He defines this *prameya*, being the object of philosophy, as 'that which is the knowledge of an object as it is; it should include any object whatsoever, as a pot, a garment, etc.'

But there are two important points to be borne in mind in this connection; the object must be based on empirical knowledge : 'It is an experience of that which is'[6], or 'an experience of that attribute which actually characterizes an object'[7].

V. The Object confined to the Phenomenal world

According to the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, undefinable knowledge is beyond the scope of valid or non-valid knowledge.[8] This undefinable knowledge forms no part of practical life, for which an instance like this will be valid : 'This is silver – with reference to actual silver'[9]. The object, in the sense of philosophical validity, therefore, to use a Kantian phraseology is confined to the phenomenal world.

VI. The Range of Object

Gotama says, on the one hand that 'sense cannot transcend on object'[10]. On the other hand, he also recognizes the validity of recognition,[11] so that mental life represents cognition plus recognition of an object which cannot take place when the mind is drawn away by another object.[12]

---

4. *viṣayaḥ – viṣiṇvanti viṣayiṇaṃ svena rūpeṇa nirūpaṇīyaṃ kurvanti, Śabdakalpadruma.*
5. *yo arthaḥ pramīyate tat prameyam, yathā ghaṭapaṭādi sarvam prameyam, Nyāyasūtra,* 1.1.1.
6. *yatra yad asti tatra tadanubhavaḥ, tadvati tatprakārakānubhavo vā, Nyāyakośa,* p. 551.
7. ibid.
8. *nirvikalpakajñānaṃ tu pramā, apramā etadbahirbhūtam eva, vyavahārāṅgatvāt,* ibid.
9. *yathā rajate 'idaṃ rajatam' iti pramā,* ibid.
10. *svaviṣayānatikramaṇendriyasya, Nyāyasūtra,* 4.2.14.
11. *viṣayapratyabhijñānāt,* ibid. 3.2.2.
12. *apratyabhijñānaṃ ca viṣayāntarānuvyāsaṅgāt,* ibid. 3.2.7.

VII. Cognition of the Object: No Extreme Duality

That the Nyāya School did not recognize an extreme duality in the cognition of the object may be inferred from Gotama's accountability of visual perception. He states that an object is perceived by the contact of a ray from the eye with the object, large or small.[13] The Vedānta deviates from this physical approach and speaks of perception occurring where at least a partial identity of congnitive *vṛtti* with the form of the perceived object takes place.[14] In Sāṃkhya, B.K. Sengupta speaks of 'a primary sense object relation which remains to be clarified'.[15]

VIII. The wide range of Godādhara's Theory of Objectivity

Gadādhara's theory of objectivity has a wide range. It has a scope, not only for the substance of an object, but also for its attributes. For the cognition of a pot in such a context as 'I know this pot', is not confined to the pot, but also extends to the attributes[16] of the pot. In fact, the substantive, in some cases, may be a mere abstraction; the attributes, however, may present a solid entity to the observer – a matter of universal experience of totality.

Moreover, Gadādhara points out that cognition has always an objective reference.[17] In this connection, although we may accept the ideal construction of an object, the 'giveness'[18] of an object also is no less an important feature of it, as S.P. Bannerjee points out.

IX. Conclusion

It would appear from the above data that –

(1) Ancient Indian view of the 'object' had a wide range, from its sensuous to mentalistic aspects.

(2) Even realistic systems, like the *Nyāya*, had to boil down their view of duality as a basic for the concept of object.

---

13. *raśmyartha–sannikarṣa–viśeṣāt tattad–grahaṇam*, ibid. 3.1.34.
14. *tattadākāra–vṛttyavacchinna–jñānasya tattadaṃśe pratyakṣatvam*, *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* of Dharmarājādhvarin, p. 74 (Saṃvat 1968 .
15. 'Unlike Advaita, Sāṃkhya does not recognize the egress of the *vṛitti* towards the object. This unique theory......makes a primary sense-object relation possible', *Summaries of papers : All-India Oriental Conference 1957*, p. 134.
16. *'ghaṭaṃ jānāmi' ity ādyākārakasya jñāne ghaṭādi samavagāhino anuvyavasāyasyāpi, sarvānubhavasiddhatayā viṣeṣaṇe api viṣayātmakajñānasambandha āvaśyakaḥ*, *Viṣayatāvāda* of Gadādhara, p. 21, Śaka, 1827.
17. *buddhir nāma kaścid ātmaviśeṣaguṇaḥ, sā ca saviṣayikā*, ibid. p. 1.
18. *Summaries of papers A.I.O.C. 1957*, p. 147; Observation by S.P. Bannerjee.

(3) The validity of the concept of the object as being limited to the phenomenal world has to be appreciated, in view of the limitations of human knowledge.

X. 'Object' as a Grammatical Concept

'Object', as a grammatical concept. has presented difficulties to experts, both modern and ancient. Thus Jespersen, states that the most popular definition of the object is that the object denotes the person or thing on which the action of the verb is performed, but this definition could not apply to an occurrence like 'John burns his finger'[19]. Pāṇini, therefore, approached the concept of the grammatical object in a non-committal presentation. Thus while in I. iv. 49 he defines the object as that which is the one most desired by the agent, in the next *sūtra* I. iv. 50 he defines the object as that which is not liked by agent, as *viṣaṃ bhuṅkte*, 'he eats poison', though Patañjali tries to find a common thread in these two *sūtras* by explaining that an undesirable object is also sometimes preferred to a more undesirable one if it happens to conflict against someone.[20]

XI. Composite and Comprehensive Nature of the Grammatical Object

Commenting on Pāṇini II. iii. 1 *anabhihite*, Kaiyaṭa says that in the utterance 'he is preparing a mat', the concept of the object is not exhausted with the formal expression 'mat'.[21] The object includes the whole process of preparing the mat.

The analytical nature of the grammatical object has been similarly exhaustively handled by Gadādhara from various points of view :-

(1) He empasizes the fact that the scope of the verb is restricted to mere action, not the fruit; the fruit of the action being the scope of the accusative suffix.[22]

(2) Gadādhara goes very deep into the logical aspects of the grammatical object, stating that in an utterance 'He smells a flower' (*puṣpaṃ jighrati*), considering the fact that nobody smells a flower, but only the odur, he has noticed four elements of this cognition.

---

19. *Philosophy of Grammar*, p. 157 (1958 ed.).
20. *viṣabhakṣaṇam api kasyacid īpsitam bhavati. katham? iha ya eṣa manuṣyo duḥkhārto bhavati so anyāni duḥkhānyanuniśamya viṣabhakṣaṇam eva jyāyo manyate*, MB. I. iv. 50.
21. *yadyat karotikriyayāptum iṣṭatamaṃ tatsarvaṃ karma, dravyaṃ, guṇaś ca. nahy asau kaṭamātreṇa tuṣyati*, K.P. II. iii. 1, p. 252 (Guruprasadasastri ed.).
22. *vyāpāramātrasya dhātvarthatvāt, Vyutpattivāda*, p. 208, Ś. 1970, Bombay.

(a) 'Predication' (*prakāratā*). The case-ending *-am* of *puṣpam* directs us to this predication (said about the object) which is strictly an attribute of case-ending.

(b) The sensuous element *odour*, technically named *viṣayatā*, objectivity lying in the odour. It was said to be a necessary condition for predication.

(c) Something 'comprehended' (*ādheyatā*), being the abstract aspect of *viṣayatā*.

(d) Inherence (*samavāya*), being an abstract relationship, which is directly related to *ādheyatā*.

It is this bundle of four relationships that has generated the concept of smelling a flower.[23]

(3) Nāgeśa's analysis of the objective case-ending as a dynamic marker:

According to Nāgeśa, the objective case-ending has a capacity for implying the function of the object,[24] for every case-ending has a capacity for denoting the function of the case[25] concerned. For instance, in the utterance *harim bhajati*, 'he adores Hari', adoration is the function of the root itself, namely *bhaj*; but the relationship of this adoration to Hari is denoted by the case-ending *-am* in *harim*.[26]

XII. Importance of the Object for the Concept of the Verb

Nāgeśa opposes the theory which excludes object from the verb. He states that if the object be dissociated from the verb, *gacchati* in the phrase *grāmaṃ gacchati*, 'he goes to the village', will give only the sense of separation[27], but the separation has some object to which it is directed.

XIII. Interrelation of Object and Action

Nāgeśa opposes the theory, attributed to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, that object and action have separate and independent functions. In his

---

23. *'puṣpaṃ jighrati' ity ādau samavāyasambandhāvacchinnādheyatvasaṃsargāvachinna-viṣayatā-nirūpita-prakārataiva dvitīyārthaḥ*, ibid. p. 276.

24. *karmaṇi vihitadvitīyāyāḥ śaktimān arthaḥ*, *Vaiyākaraṇaśiddhāntalaghumañjūṣā* of Nāgeśa, pp. 1204–5.

25. *sarva-vibhaktīnāṃ tat tatkāraka-śaktimad-dharmibodhakatvam*, ibid. p. 1205.

26. *harim bhajatīty ādau harirūpaṃ yat karma tanniṣṭha-śaktinirūpakaprītyanukūlo vyāpāyra iti bodhaḥ*, ibid.

27. *yat tu dhātoḥ kevala-vyāpāra eva śaktiḥ....grāmaṃ gacchatīty atra vibhāgasya bodhāpatteḥ*, ibid. p. 535.

opinion object and action have inherent relation, being mutually attributive.[28] Cf. similar opinion by Gadādhara, according to whom action expressed by *Caitraḥ pacati*, 'Caitra is cooking' is *pākaḥ*, 'cooking' which functions as an attribute to the substantive as a subject, so that the verbal phrase could be attributively transformed as 'Caitra with an action consisting of cooking'.[29]

XIV. General Conclusion

The grammatical object, as presented above by Grammarians and Gadādhara may sound somewhat hyperanalytical, being set up as a composite of so many elements, but although speech habits may make the perception of language quite easy, a little reflection cannot but impress one with the importance of the various delicate forces which have contributed to linguistic structure.

The general philosophical trend, both in philosophy proper and grammar, may thus reveal an urge for the ascertainment of inter-relations in the various aspects of these intellectual spheres.

28. *tatra phalavyāpārāv antaraṅgatvāt paraspara-viśeṣaṇatām anubhūyaivārthāntarānvayinau*, ibid. p. 540.
29. *Vyutpattivāda*, p. 388.

Dr. V.P. SINGH

KṚṢṆA IN HINDI LITERATURE

Background :

The *Bhakti* cult, a movement in Medieval India, preaches the most passionate devotion of love. But it is correct in no way to say that the cult sprang, developed, flourished and reached its climax only within the Medieval Period. The germs of *Bhakti* are found in the religious thought of the Hindus from the very beginning. We find references of Lord Kṛṣṇa in *Vedas*, *Brāhmaṇas*, *Upaniṣads*, *Sūtras*, *Bhāgavata*, etc. As my subject is 'Kṛṣṇa in Hindi Literature', so it will be out of place to discuss Kṛṣṇa in Sanskrit Literature.

The Bhāgavatas in 500 B.C. made Viṣṇu as the ultimate reality and sang devotional hymns in His prayer to secure salvation. According to them, 'the destiny of the emancipation is to dwell in Vaikuṇṭha enjoying eternal bliss at the feet of Viṣṇu'. This cult was taken ahead by Āḻvārs (Vaiṣṇava saints) who flourished in the period of later *Darśanas* as a counter part to Aḍiyārs (Śaiva saints)

For the first time Nāthamuni compiled the collection of their hymns in the *Nālāyira-prabandam*; probably it was edited by Nammāḻvār. Tirumaṅgai wrote the largest number of hymns and Nammāḻvār was the foremost among the saints. The Āḻvārs were ardent worshippers of Viṣṇu and their relation with God was like that of a wife to her husband.

Having such a background behind, the medieval period presented itself as a great champion of the Vaishnavism. This Vaishnavism which was dipping in Vedic age and streaming under Āḻvārs became a mighty flood and spread all over Medieval India.

Vaishnavism flourished in the South before it made its advent into Northern India in the fourteenth century. The Krishnaite cult found its leader in Śrī Vallabhācārya (1479–1531 A.D.) a Telugu brahmin, born and educated in the holy city of Benares. He named his philosophy 'Śuddhādvaita' and while recognising knowledge as a possible means of salvation stressed the supreme importance of *Bhakti* for the majority of seekers. *Bhakti*, he holds is both a means and an end and is acquired by Divine Grace or *Puṣṭi.* Kṛṣṇa who is *Brahman*, reality, intelligence and joy, alone exists. Released souls rise to Kṛṣṇa's heaven. His heaven called Vyāpi-Vaikuṇṭha and in it are a heavenly Bṛndāvan and glorious forests. From Kṛṣṇa's side springs Rādhā and from the pores of the skin of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā come millions of Gopas and Gopīs and also cattles and all the denizens of the woods. Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā sport eternally in the celestial Bṛndāvan with their devotees. The loftiest aspiration of Vallabha is to become a Gopī and sport with Kṛṣṇa in his heaven. The cult is called *sevā*, service of Kṛṣṇa. The idea of joy has great importance in this cult of *Kṛṣṇa-bhakti* and Kṛṣṇa is worshipped not as an ideal of virtue but as an image of joy.

Braja was the centre of the Krishnaite cult, where Vallabhācārya and his son Vaikuṇṭhanātha settled down and almost the entire body of poetry celebrating the beauty and erotic exploits of Kṛṣṇa is in *Braja-bhāṣā.* This poetry of Kṛṣṇa-bhaktas is extremely rich in its descriptions of the fascinations of child-hood. All that was rich, beautiful, tender or sweet was welcomed and utilised as an aid to the worship of Kṛṣṇa, for the Lord himself was not an ascetic but the embodiment of the highest beauty and keenest joy. Viṭhalanātha, the son of Vallabhācārya was the founder of *Aṣṭachāp*, a group of eight contemporary poets all of outstanding merit and devotees of Kṛṣṇa. The poets of *Aṣṭachāp* were Sūr Dās, Kumbhan Dās, Parmānand Dās, Kṛṣṇa Dās, Chit Svāmi, Govind Svāmi, Caturbhuj Dās and Nand Dās.

Sūr Dās was the most outstanding poet. He was the literary leader of *Aṣṭachāp.* His name is a by-word all over North India. Sūr Dās' poetry is limited in its scope, since it does not comprehend life in all its variety. Its pre-occupation is with the child-hood and youthful love of Kṛṣṇa. Sūr Dās depicts Kṛṣṇa in his verses first as a lovely child full of delightful pranks and next as an adolescent lover who wins the affections of women and sends them almost mad with his personal charms. He shines with matchless lustre in that little world of romance into which we are invited to escape from the tyranny of reason and reality. In its own sphere Sūr Dās' poetry is full of endless variety. It is really surprising how the blind poet could be aware of

the innumerable pleasant tricks and attitudes of little children that are a source of joy to their elders. Kṛṣṇa's infancy and childhood are described with great minuteness and every opportunity has been utilized for bringing out the sweetness of early years. Similarly the behaviour of Kṛṣṇa and the Gopikās while they lived togther in a state of mutual love comes in for detailed treatment. Their love chase, the *Rāsa*, on the bank of Jamuna in the moonlit nights, and particularly the infatuation that Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa felt for each other are described in fascinating verses of cloying sweetness. But Sūr Dās is at his best when he depicts the pangs of separation. When Kṛṣṇa migrates to Mathura and settles down there in happy enjoyment of the affections of his hump-backed mistress, the Gopikās are almost mad with grief. Kṛṣṇa sends his friend Uddhava who has certain pretensions to philosophy to console them. But no sooner does he begin his homily on the importance of *nirguṇa* as against the *saguṇa* than the Gopikās, overwhelm him with querries, taunts and pleasentries. The *Bhramargīt* which embodies this episode of the discomfiture of the rationalist in the person of Uddhava by the triumphant Gopikās who speak in the language of *Bhakti*, based on emotional attachment, is glorious poetry. It is remarkable equally for its understanding of human love and for the musical sweetness of its verse. We see here *śṛṅgāra-rasa*, at its highest and best. His genius was essentially lyrical and it is the composition of short melodious poems, expressing sincere feelings that he really excels. His poetry does not command much universality of appeal but within its own limit it is exquisite, remarkable both for its matter and manner and the blind poet of Agra holds a very prominent place in the galaxy of Hindi poets.

Nand Dās:

Among the poets of *Aṣṭachāp* next to Sūr Dās in litarary merit was Nand Dās. He was a younger contemporary of Sūr Dās. His *Rās-pañcādhyāy* and *Bhramargīt* are the famous works. The former is an excellent description of the *Rāsa* of which Kṛṣṇa and the Gopikās were so fond, and the latter is a rendering of the theme which Sūr Dās treats of in his *Bhramargīt* Nand Dās' poetry is full of rich verbal music. No other poet of *Aṣṭachāp* can claim poetic eminence comparable to that of Sūr Dās or even of Nand Dās. But they all wrote verses on the theme of Kṛṣṇa's childhood and his love sports with the Gopikās much in the same way as Sūr Dās and Nand Dās.

Hit-harivansh and Gadādhar Bhaṭ:

Hit-harivansh was the founder of a new sect known as *Rādhāvallabh-sampradāy* which laid greater stress on the worship of Rādhā than that of Kṛṣṇa. His poetry though small in volume is fine in quality. His

genious was highly inventive and he presents in his poetry numerous settings and situations in which the personal charm of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and the sweetness of love are excellently brought out. Another great poet was Gadādhar Bhaṭ, a brahmin of Āndhra who became a devotee of Kṛṣṇa and lived at Brindavan. His verses are of a fairly high order.

Mīrābāi :

Mīrābāi, the saint poetess is peerless among the poetesses of Hindi and also the best known of them. Her poetic fame depends primarily upon her *padas* which are extremely popular all over North India. They are remarkable for their sincere spiritual yearning and a complete abondon to a mood of loving worship. Mīrābāi is a devotee of Kṛṣṇa and to that extent she may be classed with Sūr Dās and other poets of *Aṣṭachāp*. But she has a mystic quality which marks her out from them. She thinks Kṛṣṇa as her lover and Lord to whom all her affections are offered without any reserve. She longs to be one with the Lord and some times feels that union has been achieved. Thus she expressed now the pangs of separation and again the joys of union.

Raskhan :

Though a muslim, he was a great devotee of Kṛṣṇa. He is the author of *Premvāṭika* and *Sujan Raskhan*. His poetry has a great popular appeal and a number of his verses are widely remembered and recited. This is due to the sweet and easy flow of his lines and also to the theme of love for Kṛṣṇa which finds a simple and fascinating treatment at his hands.

Riti Age :

Towards the middle of the seventeenth century a distinct change occurred. Poetry changed its complexion and purpose and became secular and sensuous. Poets inclined towards poetics also. It rapidly lost touch with the common man and instead of trying to tackle fundamental questions and living problems, it devoted itself to the less laudable task of catering for the sensuous pleasures of the rich The poets indulge in elaborate descriptions of the female form, choosing as their subjects scenes of union between lovers and their sweet hearts or the pangs of separation. Though it cannot be called a devotional poetry, the poets have generally depicted lovers and beloveds in the form of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. So Kṛṣṇa is always in the themes of the poets through out this age.

Modern age:

In the modern age also the theme of Kṛṣṇa has not been left by the poets. Bharatendu Harishchand depicted Kṛṣṇa in his works as incarnation of God. Ayodhyasing Upadhyay in his great epic, *Priya-pravās* depicted Kṛṣṇa as a great man, who served the humanity. This is due to scientific influence which is based on reasons. Dr. Mythili Sharan Gupta[1] has also taken Kṛṣṇa as incarnation in his *Dvāpar* and *Jayadrath Badh.* Satyanarayan Kaviratna and Babu Jagannath Dass Ratnakar also took up the old theme of Kṛṣṇa and Gopikās in their *Bhramargīt* and *Uddhavaśatak* respectively but in different styles.

Though last but not least in importance is the great epic named *Kṛṣṇāyaṇa* composed by Dr. D.P. Misra.[2] The epic is a great gain to the poetry of present era. The colourful charecter and amiable nature of Śrī Kṛṣṇa has been well depicted, in *Kṛṣṇāyaṇa.* The spiritual doctrines and gospels of Lord Kṛṣṇa have received poet's utmost attention. The love of Rādhā, affection of Gopīs for Kṛṣṇa and Yaśodā's yearning for the uplift and welfare of her loving son are some important points of Misra's epic. Plainly speaking this mainly deals with the life and philosophy of Lord Kṛṣṇa. Dr. Misra has put forth all his views regarding the life, activities and doctrines of Lord Kṛṣṇa through the medium of poetic utterances. He has succeeded beautifully in giving an ideal form to the things related to the life and deeds of Kṛṣṇa. For him Kṛṣṇa is not merely a lover of Gopīs or Rādhā, he is the bearer of the symbol of lasting human happiness, peace and tranquility on the whole. It represents the best traditions of Indian culture and civilization. Through this excellent epic Dr. Misra has laid particular emphasis on the development of the spirit of Indian culture. The views, thoughts and ideas expressed in the *Kṛṣṇāyaṇa* are no doubt clear, convincing and comprehensive. The originality of the Poet's mind is reflected in them.

Thus we see in all the periods of Hindi Literature Kṛṣṇa has been depicted by the great poets in their great works.

---

1. Dr. Mythili Sharan Gupta is an M.P. and a Poet laurate.
2. Dr. Misra is the present Vice-Chancellor of Saugar University, Saugar.

   The most remarkable thing about the *Kṛṣṇāyaṇa* is the fact that it was written inside the prison, when Dr. Misra was detained by British authorities.

Dr. A.D. SHASTRI

PRAKṚTI AND PURUṢA IN SĀṂKHYAKĀRIKĀ

Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK) is stated to be the oldest and the most authoritative work of the Sāṃkhya system. But it is very difficult to understand it. An attempt has been made here to understand and explain the concepts of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, following the *kārikās.*

The fundamental principle of the system is variously called *Pradhāna*, *Prakṛti* and *Avyakta.* It is necessary to understand the exact meaning and implication of all these terms. *Pradhāna* means 'principal'. It is the root cause, the uncaused cause of the whole world with all its wide variety. Not only so, but according to SK. 62 even the *saṃsāra* is of that principle. Thus the term *Pradhāna* is quite significant. There is one important point wich should be noted in this connection. Ordinarily in other systems *īśvara* or *Brahman* is the supreme principle. In the Sāṃkhya, on the other hand, *Īśvara* has no place, and it is the non-sentient which is *Pradhāna.* Even *Puruṣa* is not important. SK 60 even suggests that *guṇavatī* and *upakāriṇī Prakṛti* is superior to *aguṇa* and *anupakārī Puruṣa.*

In SK. 3 the term *prakṛti* is used in the sense of 'cause'; even the seven elements *mahat*, *ahaṅkāra* and five *tanmātras* are called *Prakṛti*, inasmuch as they are the causes of their respective effects. In other *kārikās* the word stands for the fundamental principle. In the Sāṃkhya, as in other systems, the term is used to denote the material, or the inherent cause.[1] While commenting on SK.9 Davies brings in the question of an efficient cause also[2], but it should be noted that the Sāṃkhya never refers to an efficient cause at all. An efficient cause must be sentient,

---

1. Cf. *prakṛteś ca pratijñādṛṣṭāntānuparodhāt*, *Brahmasūtra*, I. iv. 23.

2. John Davies: The *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Iswara Krishna, p. 17 ff.

which is not the case with *Prakṛti*. *Puruṣa* is not a doer and cannot, therefore, be an efficient cause. Though it may appear rather strange, it has to be admitted that the Sāṃkhya has explained the creation of the world without accepting any agent.

The term *avyakta* is not as easy to understand as the other two. In the very second verse the author says that the discriminative knowledge of *vyakta*, *avyakta* and *jña* is a better remedy for averting the threefold miseries, as compared with the ordinary and Vedic remedies. Here '*avyakta*' stands for *Prakṛti*, '*vyakta*' for its effects and '*jña*' for *Puruṣa*. The term *vyakta* is used for all the effects of *Prakṛti*. *Vyakta* cannot be taken to mean perceptible by sense-organs, because *mahat*, *ahaṅkāra* and *manas* are not so perceptible. Sovani thinks that while efforts are made to prove the existence of *Avyakta* and *Puruṣa* by inference, no attempt is made to prove the existence of *vyakta;* hence the contention of the *Kārikākāra* is that everything except *Pradhāna* and *Puruṣa* is an object of *pratyakṣa*.[3] This is not correct. That the author has not tried to prove *mahat*, etc., by inference does not mean that they are objects of *pratyakṣa*. Perhaps '*vyakta*' means that which is manifest in any from whatsoever. Thus *buddhi* which is defined as '*adhyavasāya*', has eight forms and it is manifested through them. Similarly *ahaṅkāra* is explained as *abhimāna* and it is experienced as such. *Prakṛti* is not an object of ordinary experience. In SK. 8 the author says that it is *anupalabdha* because it is *sūkṣma*. Can we say that the word *anupalabdha* is some sort of an explanation of *avyakta?* In SK. 7 the author has given eight reasons why an existent object does not become comprehensible. One of these causes is *saukṣmya* or subtlety. As explained by the commentators, *saukṣmya* means having a very small measure. When *Prakṛti* is stated in SK. 8 to be *anupalabdha* on account of *saukṣmya*, it cannot mean small. It must mean something which is above spatial limitations, as suggested by C.K. Raja.[4] If this is accepted, it will be easy to explain the term *avyakta* to mean that which is not only suprasensuous but which is beyond all limitations.

In SK. 9 the author has given five arguments to prove *sat kāryam*. According to the commentators these arguments prove the existence of an effect in the cause prior to its production. Davies has explained the verse differently.[5] According to his explanation '*sat*' is *kārya*. By '*sat*' he understands that which has formal existence and by

3. Sovani: *A Critical Study of the Sāṃkhya System*, p. 15.

4. C. Kunhan Raja: The *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, p. 65 ff.

5. John Davies: The *Sankhya-Karika* of Iswara Krishna, p. 17 ff.

'*asat*', the unformed *Prakṛti*. Looking to the context, the explanation of Davies appears to be better but it is difficult to accept his meaning to *sat* and *asat*. Further Davies also brings in some reference to the efficient cause, which is not admitted by the Sāṃkhya. The difficulty in the traditional explanation is that we have to add '*utpatteḥ prāk*' before '*kāryaṃ sat*'. The context does not warrant any such addition. I would like to explain the verse in this way. In SK.7 we are informed of the causes by which existing things do not become objects of apprehension. In SK. 8 it is said that *Prakṛti* cannot be apprehended because of *saukṣmya*, but it can be apprehended through its effects, *mahat* and the rest. It is now necessary to show that the effects exist and SK. 9 gives arguments for the same. All the arguments in SK. 9 can be so explained. It is not necessary, therefore, to add 'prior to production', as is done by the commentators. Thus there is no *abhāva* of the *kārya* and consequently nor of *Prakṛti*.

Five arguments given in SK. 15 are connected with the first quarter of SK. 16, which runs: *kāraṇam asty avyaktam*. This is generally understood to mean that *Avyakta* is the cause (*avyaktaṃ kāraṇam asti*). Why should we change the order of words like this? I think that it is better to construe - *kāraṇam avyaktaṃ asti* meaning 'the cause is *Avyakta*.' All the five arguments in SK. 15 can as well establish that the cause is *avyakta* as that *Avyakta* is the cause. The last argument '*avibhāgād vaiśvarūpyasya*' would actually point to our understanding of *Avyakta* as beyond all distinctions and limitations.

SK. 16 further states that *Avyakta* operates through the three *guṇas* by blending and modification. The word *guṇa* has many meanings. It means 'attribute' 'subordinate' and 'cord'. I think that all these senses are intended here. When we say that the objects of the world are full of pleasure, pain and delusion, we have in our mind the first meaning. The second is intended when *Prakṛti* is called *Pradhāna* whereas these three are *guṇas*. They are the three constituents of *Prakṛti* and their relation with it is that of *aṅga* and *aṅgin*. Lastly *guṇas* are intertwined with one another so as to make one complete whole. The best illustration of this would, of course, be the three knots of hair tied into one by intertwining them. That is how women generally dress their hair.

Sattva is light and illuminating, *rajas* is active and exciting, and *tamas* is heavy and enveloping. Thus the real contrast is between *sattva* and *tamas*, while *rajas* helps them both in their respective functions. This is clearly brought out by SK. 23 and 25. In SK. 23 the author has

given four *sāttvika* and four *tāmasa* forms of *buddhi*, but he has not mentioned any *rājasa* form. In SK. 25 the author gives three divisions of *ahaṅkāra*, namely *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa*; but the modifications are only of the first and the last, while the second works like an auxiliary force. By accepting *rajas* as an inherent attribute or constituent of *Prakṛti*, the Sāṃkhya has scored one important point, inasmuch as it has tried, however clumsily, to explain the activity of the non-sentient fundamental. The Sāṃkhya believes that sentiency and activity can be separated and need not go hand in hand.

From *Prakṛti* we now turn to *Puruṣa*. By accepting *rajas* the Sāṃkhya has separated consciousness and activity, but it has not gone so far as to say that consciousness also arises out of the non-sentient. *Puruṣa* which is neither a cause nor an effect is accepted. SK. 17 gives five arguments for the existence of *Puruṣa*. Out of these five, three arguments, namely *saṅghātaparārthatva*, *bhoktṛbhāva* and *pravṛtteḥ kaivalyārtha* are related with each other. Objects of the world are for the use of others. Thus they are objects of experience, while *Puruṣa* is the experiencer or *bhoktā*. These two arguments are connected with the design of the world and this design is preceded by the activity of designing. Thus *racanā* and *pravṛtti* both are *parārtha*. It is worthy of note that the author of the *Brahmasūtras*, while criticising the Sāṃkhya refers first to *racanā* and then to *pravṛtti*.[6] The remainirg arguments are on a different footing. *Prakṛti* is endowed with three *guṇas* and as described in SK. 11, it is objective, common, etc. These are also the characteristics of the modifications of *Avyakta*. That *kārikā* further states that *Puruṣa* is like as well as unlike *Avyakta*. This dissimilarity of the spirit is due to the absence of *guṇas* and consequent characteristics. SK. 17 states that *Puruṣa* exists because of the absence of three *guṇas* and other characteristics. It may be asked as to how can the said *triguṇādiviparyaya* be adduced as an argument to prove the existence of *Puruṣa*. If we do not believe that *Puruṣa* is devoid of *guṇas*, it will be eternally connected with them and will never be liberated from the pangs of *saṃsāra*. The *Puruṣa* must, therefore, be above the *guṇas*. The arguement of *adhiṣṭhāna* means that the activity of the non-sentient requires a superintending agent, which must be sentient. We shall refer to this point a little late.

SK. 18 gives three arguments to establish the plurality of *Puruṣas*, namely definite adjustment of birth, death and organs, non-simultaneity of activity and absence of three *guṇas*. The first two arguments are very similar but the third is different. Traditional commentators explain it

6 *racanānupapatteś ca nānumānam* and *pravṛtteś ca*, *Brahmasūtras*, II. i. 1 & 2.

as the diversity due to the preponderance of one of the attributes. I think that it is better to understand '*traiguṇyaviparyaya*' here in the same sense as *triguṇādiviparyaya* in SK. 17. The modifications of *Prakṛti* arise out of activity, which again is dependent upon the interaction of *guṇas*. Thus, because *Prakṛti* is endowed with *guṇas*, it can be many. *Puruṣa* is without these *guṇas* and so cannot multiply itself. That is why it is accepted that *Puruṣas* are many.

In SK. 19 the author describes the characteristics of *Puruṣa* as isolated, inactive, etc. The *kārikā* begins with '*tasmāc ca viparyāsāt*'. Ancient and modern scholars explain this *viparyāsa* with reference to SK. 11. Looking to the context, however, I believe that '*viparyāsa*' is to be understood here as '*traiguṇyaviparyaya*'. The characteristics of *Puruṣa* as isolated, neutral, etc., are to be understood as following from the absence of *guṇas*. Thus the author actually proves everything – existence, plurality and characteristics of *Puruṣa* by taking recourse to the absence of *guṇas*. On the whole the difference between *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* can be reduced to two points only : firstly, *Puruṣa* is sentient while *Prakṛti* is non-sentient; secondly, *Prakṛti* is endowed with *guṇas* whereas *Puruṣa* is without them.

Puruṣa and *Prakṛti* are so opposed to each other that any contact between them is not easy to understand. How is it then that the world becomes what it appears? SK. 20 is a reply to this. It is unfortunate that the commentators have not given due importance to this verse. The quality of *sattva* is illuminating and it reflects the sentiency of *Puruṣa*. It is because of this reflected sentiency that the non-sentient modifications of *Prakṛti* appear to be sentient. Similarly the reflected sentience is active and on the strength of this, the original setient *Puruṣa* seems to be active even though it is not. Thus there is only appearance and not reality. Here we find that the Sāṃkhya has to accept *adhyāsa* in some form or another, even though the system is generally accepted to be realistic. Perhaps it is impossible to explain creation without admitting *adhyāsa*, when the fundamentals – *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* are so wide apart with a 'touch-me-not tendency. That the Sāṃkhya accepts *adhyāsa* totally can be seen from SK. 62, where the author asserts that it is *Prakṛti*, which is bound, which migrates and which is liberated. *Puruṣa* is neither bound, nor liberated, nor does it migrate. It will be interesting to compare SK. 62 with the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣatkārikā*, II. 32 of Gauḍapāda.[7] The Sāṃkhya does not clearly state that the world is false

---

7. *na nirodho na cotpattir na baddho na ca sādhakaḥ |*
na mumukṣur na vai mukta ity eṣā paramārthatā ||

but we have to admit that if we go just one step forward from the Sāṃkhya position, we shall come to the Advaita.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa has given various illustrations to explain the relationship between *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. SK. 21 illustrates the relation by the lame-blind-association. SK. 57, 58 illustrate the purpose of the activity of *Prakṛti*. SK. 59 gives the example of a dancer, and SK. 60 of a maid-servant. Some understand SK. 61 as giving the illustration of a lady belonging to a noble family. It should be noted that none of these illustrations can hold water, if we examine it a little carefully. In most of the cases the illustrations are of sentient persons, while the illustrated *Prakṛti* is non-sentient. The illustration of a noble lady even lacks propriety, because while a noble lady does not show herself to any one but her husband, *Prakṛti* shows herself to other *Puruṣas*, barring the one that has seen her. In the lame-blind-association, a lame man directs a blind man, whereas here *Puruṣa* does nothing. The only example which comes near to the point at issue is that of milk which nourishes a calf. The problem is however, slightly different. It is said that *Prakṛti* brings about enjoyment and liberation of *Puruṣa*. As we have noted above, SK. 20 shows that what appears is not real *in toto*. SK. 62 says that bondage and liberation are of *Prakṛti*, while SK. 63 informs us that *Prakṛti* binds itself by means of its seven forms and isolates by one. Thus bondage and liberation are of *Prakṛti* and not *Puruṣa*. Where is the scope for *puruṣārtha* then? What is the use of giving the example of milk which nourishes a calf and not itself?

Several questions may be asked about *Puruṣa*. Are the characteristics of *Puruṣa* given in SK. 19 compatible with the arguments in SK. 17, 18? If the *Puruṣa* is totally neutral and inactive, can it be an enjoyer? Can it, further, be said that all the composite objects are for *Puruṣa*? How can it be said that the activity is for isolation, when isolation is already there before the activity began? How, again, can *Puruṣa* be a superintending agent, when he has no activity? SK. 18 is still more difficult to understand. *Puruṣas* are said to be many on the grounds of the definiteness of birth, death and organs and non-simultaneity of activity. But *Puruṣa* has no birth, no death, no organs and no activity. It may be suggested that just as in the Kevalādvaita there are two realms of experience, exoteric and esoteric, even so here also we can admit two *Puruṣas* – *Jña-puruṣa*, which is just sentient and isolated and a *Liṅga-puruṣa* who has confused himself with the modifications of *Prakṛti*. This suggestion may simplify the problem but the text of the *kārikās* does not warrant it. Again, even if we differentiate between *Jña-puruṣa* and *Liṅga-puruṣa*, it is not easy to explain how *Jña* and

Prakṛti come in contact with each other. This is one of the fundamental problems of philosophy and no system has been able to answer it in a fully satisfactory manner. The Sāṃkhya accepts that *Puruṣa* is confounded with the effects of *Prakṛti* and it is to be released. How it has happened is some thing that defies explanation.

SK. 23 gives eight forms of *buddhi*, namely *dharma*, *jñāna*, *vairāgya*, *aiśvarya* and their opposites. SK. 63 states that *Prakṛti* binds itself by means of seven forms and liberates by one, i.e. knowledge. Thus knowledge causes release while the other seven give bondage. According to SK. 65, *Puruṣa* like a witness sees *Prakṛti*, which has turned back from the seven forms of evolution and which has, therefore, ceased to be productive. After the seven forms are diverted of casual energy, the body remains like a potter's wheel, revolving through the previous impulse. When that impulse dies down, the body falls and *Pradhāna* retires. *Puruṣa* is thus absolutely and eternally isolated.

This explanation of *mokṣa* raises one very important question. Knowledge is one of the eight forms of *buddhi* and as the author says in SK. 37, *buddhi* discriminates *Puruṣa* from *Prakṛti*. *Puruṣa*, therefore, can have knowledge only through *buddhi*. How can *Puruṣa* be isolated from *Prakṛti*, unless it is isolated from *buddhi*, which is a modification of the latter? If *Puruṣa* is isolated from *buddhi* also, how can it have knowledge which is a form of *buddhi*? If *Pradhāna* retires, *buddhi* also retires, and so does knowledge. Does it mean that *Puruṣa* is simply sentient but has no knowledge? How can it be called *Jña* then? As we have seen above, the text of the *kārikās* does not suggest any distinction between exoteric and esoteric levels of knowledge.

SRI B.C. JAVALI

HARIHARA AND HIS CONTRIBUTION TO KANNAḌA LITERATURE

1. Harihara comes after the great renaissance of the twelfth century *Liṅgāyat* movement which took place in Karṇāṭak. A great many changes took place in the political life of Karṇāṭak in the twelfth century. The twelfth century is called the period of renaissance in Karṇāṭak, especially in the field of Kannaḍa literature, as a nuber of writers belonging to the ordinary strata of society, were raised to the status of high thinkers on problems of social life, language, literature, religion and above all on the problems of their daily life. Among these free thinkers there were men and many women writers such as Mahādeviyakka, Muktāyakka and others. There were many belonging to different castes and creeds and later became converted to Lingayatism. These men were trained to think freely in an institution known as *Anubhavamaṇṭapa* founded by Srī Basaveśvara of Kalyāṇa where discussions on topics of religion, philosophy, etc., took place. People of all communities, castes, occupations and grades participated in such debates. Admissions were free for all these people. Such an institution is unique in the religious history of the world. Basaveśvara's aim was to achieve high ideals in morals, manners, education and religion. His was a magnetic personality which attracted men and women from all corners of India. His way of teaching, his way of holding conferences on schemes of *sarvodaya*, his attitude towards the removal of untouchability and his concept of the dignity of labour, which were later thought of by Ruskin and Gandhiji, are noteworthy. The *Vacana* literature which is the outcome of discussions in *Anubhavamaṇṭapa* or academy of discussion is unique in the world's and Kannaḍa literature. The flashes and sparklings of these thinkers have come down to us in the form of this *Vacana* literature, which inspired many Kannaḍa and Telugu poets to think on these lines and spread all these ideals in the south. Among these were

great poets like Pālkurki Somanātha in Telugu country and Hairhara in Kannaḍa country who took the lead in establishing these ideals among the men of the south.

2. These ideas and ideals were held in high regard by such free thinkers and the poets of the first quarter of the thirteenth century both in Āndhra and Karṇāṭak. After the great bulk of *Vacana* literature, (it is traditionally known that about 160 crores of *Vacanas* were written by the authors in Kannaḍa) these poets began to interpret the greatness of those teachings on democratic lines and began to spread them vigorously among the people. In order to achieve this goal they adopted the old *Dēśi* (native) schools of litereture, and composed works on these historical men, in *Dēśi* meters like *dvipada*, *ragaḷe* (*ragaḍa* in Telugu) and *ṣaṭpadi* in Kannaḍa, that is how a school of *Purāṇa* writings was started by Pālkurki Somanātha in Āndhra who wrote *Śrī Basavapurāṇamu* in Telugu. He also composed many works in Telugu and Kannaḍa. He was a profound scholar in Telugu, Marathi, Kannaḍa and Sanskrit. Harihara who is an elder contemporary of Somanātha belonged to this school of writing. Many of the works of Somanātha were translated into Kannaḍa, especially his *Basavapurāṇamu* the earliest work on Basaveśvara in Telugu which was translated in the fourteenth century into Kannaḍa by the poet Bhīmakavi with his own adaptations. We should be glad to know that the literature which was written early by the court pandits, being principally for the pleasure of kings, and having a great deal of Sanskrit mixture in their languages, both Telugu and Kannaḍa, fell behind and the literatures for the advancement of the common man came out. Śaiva movement started once again and was vitalised by these poets and new literatures began to appear. These poets began to write *Śiva-purāṇas* and twentyfive *līlās* of Śiva in the native languages along with the works on the mystic poets and writers of the twelfth century.

As one would naturally expect, inter-relation of south Indian languages, literatures, religion and philosophers, especially of Tamil and Telugu was long forgotten, was revived and developed through their teachings and their works.

3. Harihara who undertook the scheme of composing works on all Śaiva saints irrespective of the parts of India they beloged to, started a new era in Kannaḍa language and literature by rejecting old idealogies, traditional views, forms of literatures and the language of delineation. He is aptly compared to Chaucer for narrating tales in a lucid and attractive manner. The language, i.e. Kannḍa got a new status in the

hands of this master poet. He composed many works in Kannaḍa - the most important of them are on the sixty-three Śaiva saints of Tamil Nad whose teachings had very much inspired Harihara. Those stories travelled from Tamil country to Karṇāṭak through him. In this country, works on these sixty-three men began to appear in different forms appraising their morals, manners and above all their deep devotion to Lord Śiva. These sixty-three saints are highly honoured by Liṅgāyats and works in different centuries upto this day have come to us in abundance. It is interesting to note that this number sixty-three has a peculiar significance; it represents the attainment of fulness (*aikyattva*) among the Śaivas, Liṅgāyats and Jains, etc. In addition to dissertation on all these sixty-three *Purātans* of Tamil country, Harihara also wrote works on the great poets like Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Halāyudha, Udbhaṭa and Maluhaṇa belonging to different parts of India. He composed works on Śrī Basaveśvara, Mahādeviyakka[1] and on many others also. He composed *Girijākalyāṇa* a *Campū-mahāprabhandha*, the story of Pārvatī's rigorous performance of penance to win Śiva and their ultimate marriage. Though seemingly the story has many resemblances to the story of *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa, it has its own distinct individuality. To Kālidāsa the birth of Kumāra and the description of the torture of Tāraka were important but to Harihara the *kalyāṇa* or the marriage of Pārvatī is important. It is said that the poet Harihara composed more than one hundred and twenty poems and the authorship of not less than hundred and six has already been established, and of the rest, opinion is sharply divided among the scholars,

4. Harihara's creation has been an ocean of literature and like the works of Vālmīki, Vyāsa and Guṇāḍhya a source of inspiration for the subsequent poets. A number of poets have paid glowing tributes and homages to this great man, who broke the shackles of tradition in the field of Kannaḍa poetry. Many themes of Harihara have been developed by various subsequent poets in different meters in Kannaḍa. The events and persons in Harihara's literature have stimulated the later writers as illustrations of faith in the worth of man's achievements, nobility and dignity in making the earth a heaven. Since Telugu and Kannaḍa *Dēsi* types of poetry are becoming increasingly popular, these literatures which were primarily aimed at singing will attract the southerners now-a-days. Many poems of Harihara are really gems in the great ocean of

1. Mahādeviyakka is rightly compared by scholars to Avvaiyār of Tamil land She composed *Vacanas* in Kannaḍa; she was a poetess of a very high order, who said that Lord Cannamallikārjuna alone is her husband and none else. Many work are written on this woman.

his literature and will definitely attract the attention of the world if the true spirit of the poet is brought to light. With this view in mind, I am here giving for the understanding of the scholars the theme and object of one of his higly beautiful, romantic and devotional works, namely *Maluhaṇadevacarite* written in *ragaḷe* meter (*ragaḍa* of Telugu). Harihara brought to the notice of the Kannaḍigas the importance, the greatness of all Śaivas and the great work *Periyapurāṇam* – a mine of information to Harihara on sixty-three Śaiva saints, written by Śaikkilar, in Tamil during the eleventh (?) century. (He brought in spirit the world of Tamils, Kasmirians and others close to Karṇāṭak.)

II

5. As it has been already pointed out, Maluhaṇa is a Śaiva devotee and a poet who composed many stanzas in Sanskrit in praise of Lord Śiva. It is dubious whether any works have been composed on these Sanskrit poets except Harihara's. Harihara, leaving aside Maluhaṇa's poetic talent, narrated only the romantic and the devotional story. ('Kalhaṇa', 'Bilhaṇa' are Kasmirian names like 'Maluhuṇa' – the present Maluhaṇa in Kannaḍa). Maluhaṇa at the instruction of a courtesan became a great devotee of Śiva, with which story the poet Harihara is mainly concerned. The poet as opposed to the old *sanyāsa* theory, puts forth the idea that man will also obtain salvation if he transforms his thoughts, deeds and actions in *Śivayoga*. Here we envisage a new doctrine put forth by the poet. Another work of Harihara is on Nambiyaṇṇa, who is also one of such persons, the story of whom is already very popular in Tamil literature. Nambiyaṇṇa, also known as Saundara Perumāḷe is one of the sixty-three Śaiva saints of Tamil country, The poet Harihara selects Maluhaṇa for the hero of his poem *Maluhaṇadevacarite* since there are many resemblances to Vīra Saivism and Kasmir Saivism. The relationship between Kasmir Saivism on the one hand and Vīra Saivism of South India on the other developed in those days. It is very significant that such men as Maluhaṇa who were confined only to their native land and language were brought to the light even to the southern most part of India seven hundred and fifty years ago. Harihara, recognising these men of the deepest devotion to Śiva, began to sing of their glory in the temple of Virūpākṣa in Hampi (Vijayanagar) to enrich the faith of the public.

6. Maluhaṇa (Malhaṇa in Sanskrit) was born in Kasmir's capital Bhāratī-pīṭha, the abode of Śāradā, the Goddess of knowledge, to one Suvarṇa Bhaṭṭa, who was equal in riches and honour to Kubera, the God of Wealth and also to the king of that country whose close friend he

was. Maluhaṇa was the only son of his father, who gave him the best type of education, performed the 'sacred thread ceremony' *(upanayana)* and also marriage in his early teens. Maluhaṇa's father in his old age, thinking that his only son should lead the happiest life even after his death, provided him with many comforts and set apart three crores and sixty lakhs of gold pieces so that his son might spend a thousand pieces of gold per day, calculating that he would live a hundred years, the normal age of man. And one day Suvarṇa Bhaṭṭa died of typhoid and, Maluhaṇa after observing all the necessary rites became the head of the family in its usual course. At that time he was a young lad of sixteen years, and the poet's description of the youth of this Maluhaṇa (though traditional poets never describe men like women in their *Kāvyas*, as it was not admitted by the Pandits and rhetoricians) is a masterly and a most original one.

7. In the same city was born Maluhaṇī to a courtesan Padmāvatī the best dancer in the temple of Vijayeśvara in the city. She attained youth and the poet says that her beauty in youth is indescribable in words. There was none to be compared with her beauty. These descriptions of Maluhaṇa's and Maluhaṇī's youth, are highly pleasing and appealing for the Poet's fine poetical texture, the choice of apt and significant words and similies, phrases and lines. Poetry cannot rise to nobler and more beautiful descriptions than these vivid, expressive and suggestive lines. Her delicate parts of her body developed and every incliation is towards *śṛṅgāra*. She desired every ornament to her body which was naturally fair enough. This description of Maluhaṇī by Harihara reminds us of the beautiful description of Kālidāsa's Pārvatī in the *Kumārasambhava*. Maluhaṇī attained youth, exciting beauty, and also acquired proficiency in dancing and music.

8. On an auspicious occasion in the spring season, with all the decorations, and friends, *viṭas* and *vidūṣakas*, poets, musicians and with auspicious notes of bugles, drums and other *vādyas*, Maluhaṇa went to the temple of Vijayeśvara in a procession, for the worship of Vijayeśvara, and after worship was over sat as if in meditation upon the Lord Vijayeśvara. On the same day, Padmāvatī, having beautifully decorated her daughter Maluhaṇī, took her in a triumphal procession with a host of her friends and servants to the same temple for the first devotional dance to be offered to Lord Vijayeśvara. She, while dancing, amidst so many rich and princes was seen by Maluhaṇa who, returning after his worship of God and meditations, saw and immediately fell in love with Maluhaṇī, who in turn also fixed her gaze, her attention and love all at once on Maluhaṇa. She fainted at the sight of Maluhaṇa who was smitten by the beauty of Maluhaṇī. Padmāvatī, the mother of Maluhaṇī

knowing Maluhaṇa to be rich enough, accepted Maluhaṇa, and converting the dancing stage of the temple into a nuptial hall, let them into a separate bed chamber wherein they both enjoyed their youthful love to the full extent for a period of ten years.

This incident of Maluhaṇa and Maluhaṇīs' falling in love with each other at first sight can aptly be compared to the incident of Romeo and Juliet, and Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā; their later separation is no exception. The contrast is that Romeo and Juliet, Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā are separated very early after their marriage for a long time but here Maluhaṇa is separated after a long time of their union (after ten years) only for a short while. This incident also resembles an incident of Kovalan's falling in love with a courtesan Mādhavī, though Kannaki was his married wife, in *Śilappadigāram* in Tamil, and Cārudatta falling in love with Vasantasenā in *Mṛcchakaṭika* in Sanskrit. The difference is that Cārudatta who was not rich, was attracted by the noble qualities of Vasantasenā. But Maluhaṇa and Kovalan are rich persons who loved coutesans, Maluhaṇī and Madhavī. They become extremely poor, giving everything to their beloveds. The other themes of justice in the country as is narrated in the poem *Śilappadigāram*, in the incident of the Pāṇḍya king ordering the death of Kovalan, on a false charge of theft is not found in *Maluhaṇadevacarite*. In the *Śilappadigāram* the poet Ilaṅko deals with the significance of human achievements, the question of woman's importance in society, the idea of chastity(in the story of Kannaki the wife of Kovalan) and the problem of justice and the effect of miscarriage of justice (in the collapse of the ideals of kingly honour). In the *Mṛcchakaṭika* also we notice the problem of justice is treated, but not satisfactorily, because we find that wrong doers are not punished and the only good people suffer. The story of Maluhaṇa is free from the addition of such themes and has its own peculiar greatness in making the hero and the heroine obtain salvation by becoming the true devotees of Śiva, which is absent in the stories of either Romeo–Juliet, Kovalan-Kannaki, and of Cārudatta-Vasantasenā.

9. All the money was given to Maluhaṇī's mother Padmāvatī, like Kovalan giving to Mādhavī in *Śilappadigāram*, and when the money that was reserved by Maluhaṇa's father (three crores and sixty lakhs of gold pieces) was lost within a period of ten years, Maluhaṇa became poor and was driven out of the house of Padmāvatī. Though such a huge wealth was lost, Maluhaṇa's love towards Maluhaṇī never lessened. It was a pitiful sight for Maluhaṇī also who scolded her mother for her unkind act of driving out Maluhaṇa. She also had to suffer the pangs of separation from Maluhaṇa. Maluhaṇa with great difficulty came out of

the house of Padmāvatī and in the intensity of his passion saw the vision of Maluhaṇī in all the things around in the lotuses, in the bees and the sprouts, etc. He began to cry for her wherever he went. With such a deep-rooted love, one night he stood in front of the house of Maluhaṇī who was there in the upper story of her big mansion, and in the darkness one of Maluhaṇī's servents let fall on his body the filthy water that was used to wash the dish of Maluhaṇī after supper. Maluhaṇa then cried loudly 'Oh Maluhaṇī. Maluhaṇī! where art though! Maluhaṇī'? Where upon Maluhaṇī recognising it to be the voice of Maluhaṇa came down the stairs and requested him to go home. The sight and the touch of Maluhaṇī again caused his body to become so hot that anything could be burnt when put upon his body. The separation of Maluhaṇī caused such a distress to Maluhaṇa that he stood before the house of Maluhaṇī throughout the whole night in the open air which was chilly, though his beloved went upstairs hoping that Maluhaṇa might return to his house. As it was a winter month, the snow began to fall and collect on the body of Maluhaṇa. Lots of snow settled on him and looked like a white covering (*chaddar*) for his body. He thus suffered throughout the night in that terrible cold. Harihara's power of expression is so great that he says that this freezing snow had a mere cooling action on his passion-heated body and that the heat of the body was so much that the whole water of the pond might have evaporated if he entered the pond.

In the morning, when Maluhaṇī saw Maluhaṇa, her sole lover, being tortured by the snow, she rushed to the spot where he was standing and felt that she was a sinner to have caused so much suffering for Maluhaṇa. She then took him out from the heap of snow and advised him to sing the glory of Lord Śiva and fix his passion on Him instead of on her so that he might obtain crores of Maluhaṇīs by His grace. Having received this advice from his beloved Maluhaṇī, Maluhaṇa went to the temple of Vijayeśvara, worshipped and meditated upon Him who being pleased by the severe penance-like worship and prayers of Maluhaṇa, granted a boon. Maluhaṇa immediately demanded that Lord Śiva, if He is gracious, may grant him his Maluhaṇī and nothing else. Lord Śiva granting this boon again told him that he would grant another boon, upon which Maluhaṇa prayed that he should live happily with Maluhaṇī for a hundred years and should attain His feet together with her after the hundred years. By the grace and mercy of God, Maluhaṇa obtained the desired object and married Maluhaṇī in the presence of the king of the country Pravarasena and the people. The gods also, being pleased, showered flowers upon the happy couple and smiled upon their marriage.

This story is really unique in the world's classics. Maluhaṇa, a Śaiva brahmin, becomes a great devotee of Śiva, only on the advice of a courtesan who is ultimately married by him and becomes his legal wife and attains the status of a *gṛhiṇī*. Harihara makes Maluhaṇī a *rudrakannikā* or a divine being.

10. Maluhaṇa's love towards Maluhaṇī is not an ordinary love motivated by mere lust or conjugal passion and happiness, but is pure, sacred and divine. He was ready to sacrifice even his body along with a huge stock of money for the sake of his beloved. It is divine love which is seen both in the hero and heroine of the poem.

11. The poem is revolutionary in the sense that it represents the marriage of a courtesan woman with a Kasmirean brahmin which is not perhaps sanctioned by the Sacred Books of the Hindus. Such a topic isolatedly is found in *Mṛcchakaṭika* (a Sanskrit drama) of Śūdraka wherein Cārudatta, a poor brahmin of the city of Ujjain marries a rich courtesan Vasantasenā and makes her the legal wife. In the end, in our present Kannaḍa work, a further step is achieved by the author saying that Maluhaṇa is converted also into a great devotee of Śiva on the advice of Maluhaṇī. The poet has combined the sentiment of love and the sentiment of devotion and built an edifice of devotion on the foundation of love. The poem gives a clue to the life of this Kasmirean poet, and forms the basis for the historians of Maluhaṇa's life.

12. It is believed that Harihara, in order to collect the material for his poem, travelled to Kasmir. This is supported by the evidence of his descriptions of the various buildings, flowers and crops of Kasmir and also by his mentioning of the name of contemporary king of Kasmir as Pravarasena. These clues to history are particularly interesting to all scholars and students of literary history.

13. It is difficult to say whether the social conditions depicted in the poem apply exclusively to Kasmir or to Karṇāṭak, since this is the life history of a historical person belonging to Kasmir written by a Karṇāṭak poet. It is safe to conclude that the author meant that courtesans, if good, could be married even by brahmins and that a coutesan can turn a lover into a true devotee. The poet instead of narrating her devotion towards God only indicates that she also was a true devotee of Śiva when she advised Maluhaṇa to worship Īśvara. We come to know that gold was in currency at the time when Harihara wrote this poem. Any way the study of his poems will certainly throw much light on the social conditions of his day.

14. The poet conveys the idea through this story, that money for the sons, if reserved by the parents, may, in all likelihood, be misused as in the case of Maluhaṇa. The fact that courtesans will drive people from their houses when their money is lost, is attested by the character of Padmāvatī who is only after money. Such incidents are abudant in *Daśakumāracarita* of Daṇḍin. The character of Maluhaṇī, though she is the daughter of a professional dancer Padmāvatī, is depicted nobly by the poet. Maluhaṇa also figures as a noble figure throughout the poem both in love towards his beloved and devotion towards God.

15. The poet takes us into a fairy dreamland by his delightful, lively and graphic descriptions throughout the poem. In one instance, while describing the youth of Maluhaṇa, the poet says that the body of Maluhaṇa was like a mirror to beautiful ladies. The poet has used here to suit his theme, an ornate and figurative style; perhaps not a single line is without figures of speech. The poem contains such figures like *upamā*, *utprekṣā*, *vyatireka* and *atiśayokti*.

His prose is simple but rhythmic. The poet has used alternatively, for variety, the prose which is scarcely found in Kannaḍa literature. He has used this simple prose for the quick narration of the story. The prose of Harihara has all the beauty of the prose of Daṇḍin but at the same time is free from Bāṇa's difficult compounds.

The chief cause of the popularity of his works is the facility of the poet's style of which this work is a fine example. Even prose is ornamented with the usual figures. The poet evinces a considerable power of imagination supplemented with the direct narration of the story. He does not add either anything which is inessential to the development of the story or leave anything which is essential.

16. The opportunity given to the youths of both the sexes in the days of the poet to form connections with one another in the temples and often fall in love with each other, was the characteristic of the day, and is also confirmed by one more such incident found in Cāmarasa's *Prabhuliṅgalīle* – a Kannaḍa classic of the fifteenth century, which has been rendered into Tamil, Telugu, Marathi and Sanskrit in the old days, by the meeting of Prabhu and Māyādevī in a temple of Madhukeśvara in Banavāsi.

17. On the whole, we can conclude that the poet Harihara is one of those rare persons who have exceptional qualities of intelligence, wide observation and power of imagination. He is a star of the first magnitude in the galaxy of Kannaḍa poets.

Dr. V. VARADACHARI

INFLUENCE OF SANSKRIT ON TAMIL LITERATURE*

No clan or group of people can live in isolation unaffected by the contacts with other groups of people. Cultural contacts, political conquests and commercial enterprises bring together peoples of various groups. Such impacts when effected among the groups of varying standards in life, create, among peoples of lower standards, a liking for the concepts, matters, expressions and words of those who are superior to them and prompt them to borrow whatever is attractive and useful for them. Some of what is borrowed gets absorbed in them and ceases to be foreign. Others however remain with their specific nature to be used on occasions of importance.

Sanskrit is less influenced by the other languages of India which owe much to Sanskrit for their growth and development. The Tamil language, which belongs to the Dravidian group, bears the impact of Sanskrit, to a relatively small degree when compared to the other Indian languages. One specific feature, which the Tamil language reveals, is that what was borrowed was given a shape peculiarly belonging to Tamil. So to a superficial reader, the correspondence between the original Sanskrit word and its Tamilised form becomes scarcely noticeable.

Even in the centuries before the birth of Christ, the Sanskrit words got incorporated into Tamil literature. The *Tolkappiyam*, the earliest available work on Tamil grammar, recognises this and contains rules and illustrations for the Tamilised Sanskrit words. The works of the Saṅgam period use such words as if they are Tamil words. The Tamil epic *Śilappadikāram*[1] speaks of the necessity to know the beauties of the languages of other regions. The reputed *Kavirippumpattinam* is described to have peoples speaking various languages.[2]

---

*Paper read in the Sanskrit Day Celebrations conducted at Tirupati in August 1969.

1. Ch. 3. 1. 30–31.
2. *Paṭṭinappālai*, 1. 215–217.

Vīdi, *kalāpam*, *śikaram*,[3] *kāraṇam*, *nūpuram*, *nemi*, *mekalai*[4] and others occur in the literature of the Saṅgam period. *Thūṇam*[5] (*sthuṇā*), *koṭṭam* (*goṣṭha*),[6] *kovalar* (*gopāla*)[7], *aravam* (*rava*)[8], *āṇi* (*āṇī*)[9], *eṇi* (*śreṇi*)[10] may also be added to this list.

According to Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, the *Prākṛta* forms of the Sanskrit words *kumāri*,[11] *pāpa*,[12] *kopa*,[13] *duḥkha*,[14] *stambha*,[15] *pattanam*,[16] *sneha*,[17] *padma*,[18] *dhīratva*,[19] *śūratva*,[20] *śukti*,[21] *kṛṣṇa*[22] and *rakta*[23] are respectively *kumarī*, *pāva*, *kova*, *dukkham*, *khambha*, *paṭṭaṇam*, *sineha*, *paduma*, *dhīrattaṇam*, *śūrattaṇam*, *sippī*, *kaṇho* and *rattam*. Most of these words are identical with the words current in Tamil but the date of this work, which is placed in the sixth century A.D., does not give definite evidence in favour of Tamil having been influenced by this work; since, Sanskrit words were absored in the Tamil literature in the centuries even before the birth of Christ.

Learned words were also borrowed by the Tamil literature particularly in the subjects of music, dancing and philosophy. Several kinds of musical instruments and mode of playing on them are referred to in Tamil literature.[24] Nārada as an eminent player on the lute is mentioned[25] and the commentators find here a reference to the *Nārada-śikṣā*, a Sanskrit work on music.[26] Following the Sanskrit classics, the Tamil works clasify

3. These three occur in *Akanānūru*.
4. These three are found in *Kalittokai*.
5. *Perumapāṇārrupāṭai*, 316.
6. *Puranānūru*, 229.
7. *Perumpāṇārruppaṭai*, 166.
8. *Kuruntokai*, 667.
9. ibid. 667.
10. *Purāṇānūru*, 35.
11. *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, 1.9.
12. ibid. 2.2.
13. ibid. 2.13.
14. ibid. 2.25.
15. ibid. 3.14.
16. ibid. 3.23.
17. ibid. 3.63.
18. ibid. 3.64.
19. ibid, 4.21.
20. ibid. 4.21 is applicable.
21. ibid. 4.34.
22. ibid. 5.1.
23. ibid. 7.59.
24. *Śilappadikāram*, 3.17.
25. ibid. 17.1.
26. ibid. p. 458 Swaminatha Iyer's edn.

dance[27] into *deśi* and *mārga* kinds, and refer[28] to *piṇḍi*, name of dance poses to be shown with one hand and divided into thirty three kinds[29] and to *piṇaiyal*,[30] that to be shown with two hands and classified into fifteen kinds. *Patākai, arāṭam, śukatuṇḍam, kamalakośikam, alāpattiram* and others are brought under the former group and *padumāñjali, kapotakam* and others come under second group. The technical words,[31] which are used in several systems of thought, are used as they are, of course making them take a form after the Tamil system of word formation. For instance the word[32] *vipakkaikadesaviruttisapakkavyāpi* is used for *vipakṣaikadeśavṛttisapakṣavyāpi*. There are references to the eight places of sound production,[33] to the lunar mansions,[34] and constellations.[35] The sentiments are enumerated as eight in some works[36] and as nine in others.[37] The *vyabhicāribhāvas* are thirty three[38] and the love stages are ten.[39] The *Tolkappiyam*[40] deals with the merits and defects in poetry. The literary manners (*ritis*) are three, as enumerated by Vāmana and the number of figures of sense (*arthālaṅkāra*) is thirty five.[41] The world is referred to as made up of the five elements.[42] The work *kāra*, which is used in Sanskrit literature to refer to the syllables, e.g., *akāra, takāra*, etc., is used by the grammarians of Tamil for a similar purpose, e.g., *makāra*.[43]

The Brahmins came earlier than the Kṣatriyas and settled in the Tamil Nadu. They recited and taught the *Vedas*.[44] They became part of the peoples speaking Tamil. In fact some of them became poets and they were much respected in these regions.[45] The great sacrifices were performed by the Coḷa kings[46] and the marriage customs like coming round the fire were gone through with the help of these priests.[47]

27, ibid. 3.1.12.
28. ibid. 3.
29. Com. on ibid.
30. ibid.
31. *Maṇimekhalai*, ch. 27 and 29; *Nīlakeśī*, ch. 2, 7, 8 & 9.
32. *Maṇimekhalai*, ch. 29.1.243.
33. *Tolkāppiyam – Eluttiladikāram*, 4.
34. *Puranānūru*, 229.
35. ibid.
36. *Tolkāppiyam – Meyppāṭṭu*, 3.
37. *Māranālaṅkāram*
38. *Tolkāppiyam – Meyppāṭṭu*, 12.
39. ibid. *Kalaviyal*, 9.
40. ibid. *Colladikāram*.
41. *Daṇḍiyalaṅkāra*
42. *Tolkāppiyam – Marabiyal*, 89.
43. ibid, *Ceyyuliyal*, 240.
44. *Kuruntokai*, 156.
45. Kāśyapa, Ātreya, Kauśika and others were Brahmin poets in *Narriṇai*.
46. *Puranānūru*, 2; *Perumpāṇārruppaṭai*, 315–6.
47. *Śilappadikāram*, 1–52, 53.

The Vedic deities such as Viṣṇu and Kāma, the God of love become popular along with Śiva, Durgā, Kumāra and others. Baladeva[48] and Kṛṣṇa had temples separately and Viṣṇu is referred to as foremost to be known through the *Vedas*.[49] The episodes connected with the divine descent of Viṣṇu as Kṛṣṇa are frequently referred to.[50] Along with the Vedic recitation, the Tamil songs were also sung in temples during worship.[51]

The *Śilappadikāram* contains the story of the mangoose which was killed by a brahmin woman who mistook it as having killed her child and put it to death.[52] This story occurs in the *Pañcatantra* from which this work takes the story. *Peruṅkātai* is a Tamil version of Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkathā*.

There is a strange reference in these Tamil works to the use of Sanskrit words[53] to cajole and make the elephants take food.

Kamban[54], who is much indebted to Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, is found to describe Daśaratha's old age in the words, "The white hairs on the cheek of Daśaratha appeared to secretly tell the king 'O King! give the kingdom to your son. You have reached the age for performing severe penance." This reminds to us of the following *śloka* of Kālidāsa[55]

tāṃ karṇamūlam āgatya rāme śrīr nyasyatām iti /
kaikeyīśaṅkāyevāha palitacchadmanā jarā //

On account of the influence of Sanskrit on Tamil language and literature, the Tamil scholars who took to the study of Sanskrit evolved the *Grantha* system of alphabets, thus making Sanskrit familiar to the Tamilians. Another result was the rise and growth of the *Maṇipravāla* style, in which Sanskrit and Tamil got mixed up very freely. This happened between tenth and fifteenth centuries. In the field of drama and dance, *Bharatasenāpatīyam* of Ādivāyilar, *Bharatasaṅgraha* of *Araṃvalartān*, *Abhinayadarpaṇam* of Vīrarāghava Aiyan became prominent to represent Tamil writing and *Daṇḍiyalaṅkāra* and *Māranālaṅkāra* of Tirukkurukaipperumāl Kavirāyar of the eleventh century in the field of rhetorics.

48. ibid. 14.1.7 to 11.
49. ibid. *Ūrkāṇḍa*, 46–49.
50. *Paripāṭal*, 3-31, 32.
51. *Parimelalagar* on *Paripāṭal*, 18,51; *Patirruppāttu*, 50.
52. *Śilappadikāram*, 15.1 54 to 75.
53. *Jīvakacintāmaṇi*, 1834; *Mullaippāṭṭu*, 35–37; *Malaipatukatam*, 1.327.
54. *Kamba-Rāmāyaṇa – Ayodhyākāṇḍa – Mantaraipaḍalam.*
55. *Raghuvaṃśa*, XII. 2.

Not withstanding the impact of Sanskrit, the Tamil literature has some noteworthy features. Firstly, whatever was borrowed was tamilised before making use of it. Secondly, prosody had an indigenous development which has nothing in common with Sanskrit. *Kalippā* and *Veṇpā* became well-known metres. Thirdly, dance postures were adopted to depict certain episodes. Death of Kaṃsa was adopted to *Alliyattokuṭi*[56] slaying of Śūra to *Tuḍikkūttu*,[57] rescuing Aniruddha from Bāṇa to *Kuḍakkūttu*[58] and so on. Fourthly, the words of foreign origin were avoided as far as possible. However, in some cases, the original Tamil words were superseded by sanskrit words. The word *uyir* which means self came to possess less importance than the Sanskrit *ātmā* becoming changed into *ānmā*. The word *paśu* is used in the sense of cow, although the words *ā*, *ān* and *karavai* are available. The word *paḍi*, which is the tamilised form of the Sanskrit root *pat*, has replaced the word *karral*. Fifthly, there is the division of subject matter into *akam* and *puram*. The former deals with the family life and the latter with the other aspects of life. This division is indegenous to Tamil literature. Lastly, *etukai* and *monai*, are two methods of using the syllables in versification and are peculiarly Tamil in origin. The same is the case with the *antādi* type. Curiously enough these last mentioned features are found employed in the Sanskrit work *Sarvadevavilāsa*, a *campū* belonging to the last century.

The religious poetry in the form of the compositions of the Āḷvārs and Nāyanmārs bear ample testimony to the selective use of the words and matters in the Sanskrit literature, employing the pure Tamil words to maximum effort and producing the most elegant and charming outpourings of lyrics that are the treasure and pride of Tamil literature.

56. *Śilappadikāram*, 6. 1. 46–48.
57. ibid. 49–51.
58. ibid 54–55.

SRI M.S. NARAYANA MURTI

TWO VERSIONS OF THE EKASAṂJÑĀDHIKĀRA

0.0 That the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* had undergone some modifications in the wording as well as the order of the rules, sometimes leading to the evolution of different versions, is evident from the commentary of Patañjali. He makes it clear that two such versions have been evolved with regard to the text of rules read in the section of the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra*. The present paper aims at bringing out some of the probable changes both in the wording and interpretation leading to emerging of the two versions.[1]

1.0 Patañjali states that both the versions of the rules from I. iv. 1 to II. ii 38 are equally authentic[2]. As the text adopted by Patañjali alone was followed by the later grammarians, the other went into oblivion. So no information regarding the latter version could be found in any of the later commentaries further to what is found in MB. The information that could be gleaned from MB evidences that the influence of one version over the other is so much that many a word in one version is incorporated in the other. Further some of the rules that fit in a particular context in one version are transferred to a different context in the other, some times even out of the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra*.

1.1 Whatever might be the relative merits of the two versions both of them have a common aim, namely the prohibition of the concourse of certain technical names. So the difference between the two versions lies only in the technic adopted in the presentation of rules. But when the order or the wording of the rules is disturbed the interpretation also

1. Refer to my article *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, S.V. University Oriental Journal*, vol. X, pp. 11 – 22.
2. *ubhayathā hy ācāryeṇa śiṣyāḥ sūtram pratipāditāḥ*, *Mahābhāṣya* (MB), I. iv. 1, p. 271, Guruprasadasastri ed., 1939.

changes. Consequently the meta-rule which supplies the principle of interpreting the rules in this section is read in two ways: i) *ākaḍārād ekā saṃjñā* and ii) *prāk kaḍārāt paraṃ kāryam*. The difference between the two readings is that while the former purports a restrictive injunction (*niyama-vidhi*) the latter a prescriptive injunction (*vidhi=apūrva-vidhi*).[3] The rule *ākaḍārād ekā saṃjñā* is a restrictive injunction inasmuch as it permits the operation of only one *saṃjñā* at a time indicating that it presupposes the simultaneous application of more than one *saṃjñā* at a particular instance.[4] When the concourse of names is required some device to nullify the operation of the rule should be adopted; for which purpose the Ekasaṃjñādhikāravādin takes recourse of the principle of *anuvṛtti*.

1.2. The *Paraṃkārya-pakṣa* is evolved to avoid *anuvṛtti* as it involves the additional effort in the form of reading the rule as an *adhikāra* or adding the particle *ca* or taking recourse to a *jñāpaka*.[5] Consequently the text of the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra* version is modified both in order and wording in such a way that the concourse of desired *saṃjñās* is effected without any prejudice to the purport of the rules.

The rule *prāk kaḍārāt paraṃ kāryam*, being a prescriptive injunction ordains the application of that *saṃjñā* which is succeeding (*para*) in the Sūtra-text, in case of a conflict.[6] Here the word *para* in the rule is indicative of the prevalence of *bādhyabādhakabhāva* among the technical names read under this section and it stands for the name which has a chance to be superseded by the former one.[7] When the concourse is

3. *ādyapāṭhe tv ekaiva saṃjñā na dvitīyeti niyamo, vidhyarthatvāsambhavāt. atra ca vidhyarthatvasambhavena niyamo na yukta iti bhāvaḥ*, Nāgeśa's *Udyota* (NU) the subcomm. on MB, ibid. p. 272.

4. *anyatra saṃjñāsamāveśād etasmāt kāraṇād ākaḍārād api saṃjñānāṃ samāveśaḥ prāpnoti. iṣyate caikaiva saṃjñā syād iti tac cāntareṇa yatnaṃ na siddhyatīti niyamārthaṃ vacanam*, MB. ibid. p 271.

5. *tatraikā sa·jñety asmin pāṭhe kvacit saṃjñāsamāveśārtho yatnaḥ kartavyaḥ*. KP. ibid.
See also :
yatnaḥ – jñāpakāśrayaṇacakārādirūpaḥ, NU ibid.

6. *tatra paraṃ kāryam ity anuvṛttir yathā syād iti tatra yasyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ parasyāḥ pūrvayānavakāśayā bādhaḥ prāptaḥ, sā parā bhavatīti vidhirūpeṇāsya pravṛttiḥ*, Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*, the comm. on *Kāśikā* (PM), I.iv. 1, p. 497 (Prachya Bharati Series 1965).

7. *etad eva ca parasaṃjñāvidhānaṃ jñāpakam atra prakaraṇe saṃjñānāṃ bādhyabādhakabhāvasya. tena parayānavakāśayā sāvakāśī pūrvā bādhyate. dvayoś ca sāvakāśayor vipratiṣedhe parayā pūrvā bādhyata ity etad atra vastutattvam* KP. I. iv.1, p. 273.
See also :
tatra yasyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ parasyāḥ pūrvayā bādhaḥ prāpnoti, sā parānena bhāvyata iti vidhyarthaṃ sūtraṃ bhavati na niyamārtham, ibid. p. 271.

desired the *niravakāśa* name is read as preceding the *sāvakāśa*. Even though the meta-rule sets at naught the *niravakāśa-saṃjñā*, the concourse is justified on the strength of *ārambhasāmarthya*.[8] In other words, if the *sāvakāśa* name superseds the *niravakāśa*, the mention of the latter as a preceding one not only becomes purposeless but also superfluous. So as to avoid this contingency the *niravakāśa* should also be admitted as coming into operation because of its very formation, i.e. *ārambhasāmarthya*.

On the other hand when the concouse of *saṃjñās* is to be prohibited, the *sāvakāśa* is read as preceding the *niravakāśa* and consequently the meta-rule sets at naught the application of the preceding name when the succeeding has a chance to apply.[9] Both of them do not have any chance of simultaneous application because there is no room for the superfluity of either of the *saṃjñās* (on account of the *sāvakāśa-saṃjñā* is applicable to the cases other than those of the *niravakāśa-saṃjñā*). Thus the Paraṃkāryavādin need not change the rules of the Ekasaṃjñādhikāravādin either in order or wording for the prohibition of the simultaneous operation of *saṃjñās*.

When there is the conflict of equal force (*tulyabalavirodha*), the immediately following rule *vipratiṣedhe ca*[10] ordains the application of the succeeding rule in the order of the Sūtra-text.

1.3 So the evolution of the two versions is due to the difference in the technic adopted in effecting the concourse of technical names in the section of their prohibition.

2.0 Now we shall examine how the Paraṃkāryavādin would avoid the *anuvṛtti* for the concourse and how he would read his Sūtra-text.

2.1 In the case of the concourse of *kāraka*, *nipāta* and *samāsa* with their sub-class names, there is no other way for the Paraṃkāryavādin than to read them as *adhikāras* as in the version of the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra-pakṣa*.[11] So the question of modifying the order arises only in the instances in which the concourse of the terms is indicated by *ca* in the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra*. The rules are modified in such a way that the

8. cf. *tatrārambhasāmarthyāc ca bhapadasaṃjñe, paraṃkāryatvāc cāṅgasaṃjñā bhaviṣyati*, MB. ibid. p. 273.

9. *tena parayānavakāśayā sāvakāśā pūrvā bādhyate*, *Śabdakaustubha*, (ŚK), I, iv. 1.

10. The words *param* and *kāryam* as found in the rule *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam* of the set of rules suited to the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra* need not be read in this version because they are taken from the previous rule to this by *anuvṛtti*.

11. Vide: *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra in the Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 2.2 & 2.3, *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, vol. X. pp. 17–18.

niravakāśa always follows the *sāvakāśa-saṃjñā* and the particle *ca* is elided. The text of the rules as suggested by Patañjali may be shown as follows :[12]

		Ekasaṃjñādhikāra	*Paraṃkāryavāda*
1)	I. iv. 42	*sādhakatamaṃ karaṇam*	*divaḥ sādhakatamaṃ karma*[13]
	43	*divaḥ karma ca*	*karaṇam*
2)	I. iv. 54	*svatantraḥ kartā*	*svatantraḥ prayojako hetuḥ*[12]
	55	*tatprayojako hetuś ca*	*kartā*
3)	I. iv. 59	*upasargāḥ kriyāyoge*	*upasargāḥ kriyāyoge*[13]
	60	*gatiś ca*	*gatiḥ*

2.2 With regard to the concourse of *karmadhāraya* and *dvigu* with *tatpuruṣa*, the order of the rules will be as follows. Firstly the rule *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ* (I ii.42) defining the scope of application of the name is dropped altogether. To get the same effect the word *karmadhārayaḥ* is added to the rule II.i.49 reading as *pūrvakālaikasarvajaratpurāṇanavakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇena karmadhārayaḥ*. And the rules from II.i.22 to 48 are read after enunciating all the rules relating to *karmadhāraya* (i.e. II.i.49 to 72) so that the name *karmadhāraya* comes into operation along with *tatpuruṣa* on account of its formation.[14] Secondly the rule *dviguś ca* (II.i.23) is dropped. And for the concourse of *dvigu* with *tatpuruṣa* the Paraṃkāryavādin need not modify the rule *saṃkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ* (II.i.52).[15] So the rules may be arranged as follows:

	Ekasaṃjñādhikāra	*Paraṃkāryavāda*
II.i.22	*tatpuruṣaḥ*	*pūrvakālaikasarvajaratpurāṇanavakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇena karmadhārayaḥ*

12. *gatidivaḥ karmahetumatsu cagrahaṇam*, MB. I. iv. 1, Vt, p. 276.

13. ibid. As the *upasarga-saṃjñā* is actually a *niravakāśa* with reference to *gati*, the order of the rules is not changed except dropping the particle *ca*.

14. *pūrvā tasya karmadhārayasmajñā, parā tatpuruṣasaṃjñā. katham? evaṃ sa vakṣyati – 'pūrvakālaikasarvajaratpurāṇanavakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇena karmadhāraya' iti*, MB. I. iv. 1, p. 274. See also: *mayā tv asminn eva prakaraṇe karmadhārayasmjñā kriyate, samāveśaś ca sidhyatīti tatpuruṣagrahaṇaṃ na kartavyam bhavatīti lāghavam bhavati*, KP. ibid. p. 275.

15. *evaṃ sa vakṣyati – 'taddhitārthottarapadasamāhāre ca saṃkhyāpūrvo dvigur' iti. evaṃ sarvaṃ dviguprakaraṇam anukramya tasyānte 'śritādibhis tatpuruṣa' iti. tatrārambhasāmarthyāc ca dvigusaṃjñā, paraṃkāryatvāc ca tatpuruṣasaṃjñā bhaviṣyati*, MB. ibid. p. 276.

23	*dviguś ca*	*diksaṃkhye smjñāyām*
24	*dvitīyāśritātīta°*	*taddhitārthottarapadasamāhāre ca*
25	to 48	*saṃkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ*
49	*pūrvakālaikasarvajaratpurāṇa-navakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇena*	Rules 53 to 72 of the other versoin in the same order
50	*diksaṃkhye saṃjñāyām*	*tatpuruṣaḥ*
51	*taddhitārthottarapadasamāhare ca*	*dvitīyā śritātīta°*
52	*saṃkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ*	(Rule 23 is dropped)
53	to 72	Rules 25 to 48 of the other version in the same order.

2.3 Of the three instances, in which the *anuvṛtti* is justified on the strength of *jñāpaka* in the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra* version,[16] there is no necessity in this version either for *jñāpaka* or for the change of rules for the concourse of *nadī* and *ghi* with *guru* and *laghu* respectively. According to this version, even if the vowels *i* and *u* are taken as *ghi*, and *ī* and *ū* as *nadī* without resorting to take them as *i*–ending and *u*–ending feminine stems for *ghi*, and *ī*–ending and *ū*–ending feminine stems for *nadī* both of them come into operation with reference to *laghu* and *guru* respectively. The terms *laghu* and *guru*, however, come into operation being next in the succession.[17]

2.31 With reference to the concourse of *aṅga* with *pada* and *bha* the order of the rules is suggested as follows [18]

	Ekasaṃjñādhikāra	*Paraṃkāryavāda*
I.iv. 13	*yasmāt pratyayavidhis tadādi pratyaye 'ṅgam*	*yasmāt pratyayavidhis tadādi suptiṅantam padam*
14	*suptiṅantam padam*	*naḥ kye*
15	*naḥ kye*	*siti ca*
16	*siti ca*	*svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*
17	*svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*	*yaci bham*
18	*yaci bham*	*tasau matvarthe*
19	*tasua matvarthe*	*ayasmādini chandasi*
20	*ayasmādīni chandasi*	*pratyaye 'ṅgam.*

16. Vide: *Ekasamjñādhikāra in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, 3.*

17. *yasya punaḥ paraṃkāryatvaṃ niyamānupapattes tasyobhayoḥ saṃjñayor bhāvaḥ siddhaḥ. katham? pūrve tasya nadīghisaṃjñe, pare gurulaghusaṃjñe, tatrārambhasāmarthyāc ca nadīghisaṃjñe, paraṃkāryatvāc ca gurulaghusaṃjñe bhaviṣyataḥ,* MB. I iv. 1, p. 279.

18. *pūrve tasya bhapadasaṃjñe, parāṅgasaṃjñā. katham? evaṃ sa vakṣyati – 'yasmāt pratyayavidhis tadādi suptiṅantam padam', 'naḥ kye', 'siti ca', 'svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne', 'yaci bham', tasyānte 'pratyaye 'ṅgam' iti. tatrārambhasāmarthyāc ca bhapadasaṃjñe, paraṃkāryatvāc cāṅgasaṃjñā bhaviṣyati,* ibid. p. 273.

2.32 As for the concourse of *parasmaipada* and *puruṣa*, the rules relating to *puruṣa*, i.e. I. iv. 101 to 108 are read before the rules relating to *parasmaipada*, i.e. I. iv 99 & 100.[19]

3.0 Even though this version exhibits the economy of words indicative of concourse of names, it is not free from the flaws of over pervasion. There are certain instances that go against the rule *prāk kaḍārāt paraṃ kāryam* in which the *niravakāśa* that has to supersede the *sāvakāśa* precedes the other. For example *nadī* (I. iv. 6) an *ghi* (I. iv. 7) get a chance for simultaneous operation in the declension of the feminine words ending in *ī* and *ū* when the declensional ending possesses the indicatory *ṅ* (*ṅit*), i.e. before the singular case-affixes of dative, ablative, genitive and locative.[20] Thus in the derivation of the dative singular of *śakaṭi*, the augment *ā* (*āṭ*) is added to the case ending in *e* (*ṅe*) by the rule *āṇ nadyāḥ* (V. iii. 112) as the *nadī-saṃjñā* will operate according to the rule *ṅiti hrasvaś ca* (I. iv 6) when it is in the stage of *śakaṭi+ā+e*. If the *ghi-saṃjñā* also operates, *i* of the stem is substituted by *guṇa* (*e*) and consequently the form *śakaṭyai* cannot be secured.[21] Hence to prevent the concourse of names the word *śeṣa* is added to the rule I. iv. 7.

However in this case the absence of the concourse of technical names can be justified even without the word *śeṣa* in the rule, on the validity of the Paninian rule itself. Should *ghi* operate in the derivation of *śakaṭyai*, it must come into force before *nadī*, because it is *antaraṅga* with reference to *nadī*. If it comes into operation before *nadī*, the final vowel of the stem is substituted by *guṇa* and as such *nadi* cannot operate because the essential condition for the operation of *nadī*, namely the stem should end in *ī* or *ū* is not satisfied. Even the *sthānivadbhāva* cannot be considered because it is prohibited in the case of *alvidhi* by the rule *sthānivad ādeśo 'nalvidhau*, (I. i. 56). Hence the framing of the rule necessitates the non-concourse of *saṃjñās*.[22]

---

19. *pūrvā tasya puruṣasaṃjñā parā parasmaipadasaṃjñā*, ibid. p. 280.

20. *itarathā hi paraṃkāryatvāc ca ghisaṃjñā, ārambhasāmarthyāc ca 'ṅiti hrasvaś ca' iti nadīsaṃjñā*, MB. I. iv. 1, p. 282.

21. *śakaṭiśabdān ṅepratyaye kṛte paratvān nadīsaṃjñānimitte āṭi kṛte tasya ṅidbhaktatvāt 'gher ṅiti' iti guṇaḥ prāpnoti*, KP. ibid.

22. *yady atra ghisaṃjñā pravarteta tadāntaraṅgatvāt pūrvam eva tasyāḥ pravṛttiḥ syāt. nadīsaṃjñā tu ṅipratyayāpekṣayā bahi aṅgā. tatra ghilakṣaṇe guṇe kṛte hrasvābhāvād alvidhitvāc ca sthānivattvābhāvān nadīsaṃjñā naiva pravarteteti nadīsaṃjñāvidhānaṃ hrasvasyānarthakam eva syāt. tasmān nadīsaṃjñā vidhānasāmarthyād atra ghisaṃjñā na bhavatīti*, ibid.

3.1 But the word *śeṣa* in the rule *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* (II. ii. 23) is essential to prevent the application of the *bahuvrīhi-saṃjñā* to the *avyayībhāva* and *tatpuruṣa* compounds when their sense is something other than that is conveyed by the constituents *(anyapadārtha)*.[23] For example the *avyayībhāvas* like *unmattagaṅgam* and *lohitagaṅgam* in the sense of a proper noun, the *upamānasamāsas* like *śastrīśyāmā* in the sense of the *upameya*, the *dvigu-samāsas* like *pañcagavam* and *daśagavam* in the sense of aggregation *(samāhara)*, the *kṛllopa-samāsas* like *niṣkauśāmbiḥ* ahd *nirvārāṇasiḥ* in the sense of *krānta*, etc., are ordanided in *anyapadārtha* by the rules *anyapadārthe ca saṃjñāyām* (II. i. 21), *upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ* (II. i. 55), *taddhitārthottarapadasamāhāre ca* (II. i. 51) and *kugatiprādayaḥ* (II. ii. 18) respectively. In order to prevent such concourse the word *śeṣa* is incorporated in the rule. The word *śeṣa* is taken as referring to only those instances in which no compound is ordained.[24] The *bahuvrīhi-saṃjñā* does not operate in the above cases because the word *śeṣa* prevents the application of it for the compounding of those words has already been enjoined by the preceding rules.

3.2 Similarly the names *pada* and *bha* get a chance to operate simultaneously before the *pratyaya* which has *s* for *it*.[25] For example the Vedic form *ṛtviya* (RV. 3. 19. 10) cannot be secured because of the operation of the *pada-saṃjñā* on account of its formation *(ārambhasāmarthya)* as well as *bha-saṃjñā* on account of its being next in the succession *(paraṃkāryatva)*.[26] The word *ṛtu* takes the secondary suffix *ghas* by *chandasi ghas* (V. i. 106) and *ghas* is substituted by *iya* by *āyan-ey-īn-īy-iyaḥ pha-ḍha-kha-cha-ghām°* (VII. i. 2). *Ṛtu+iya* becomes *ṛtviya*. If *bha-saṃjñā* were to appear there, *u* would have taken *guṇa* by the rule *or guṇaḥ* (VI. iv. 146) and consequently the form *ṛtviya* cannot be secured.

4.0 As we do not have at hand the full text of the *paraṃkārya* as it was available to Patañjali, we cannot positively say how far this version had been influenced by the other. As regards the influence of the *Paraṃkārya-pakṣa* prevailed upon the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra*, we may note two instances.

---

23. *bahuvrīhipratiṣedhārthaṃ tu śeṣagrahaṇaṃ kartavyam - 'śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ' iti. kim prayojanam? prayojanam avyayībhāvopamānadvigukṛllopeṣu*, MB. ibid.

24. *yeṣām padānāṃ yasminn arthe 'vyayībhāvādikaḥ samāso na vihitaḥ sa śeṣa ity arthaḥ*, PM. II. ii. 23.

25. *paravacane siti padam bham*, MB. I. iv. 1, p. 280.

26. *'ayaṃ te yonir ṛtviyaḥ'. 'prajāṃ vindāma ṛtviyām'. ārambhasāmarthyāc ca padasaṃjñā, paraṃkāryatvāc ca bhasaṃjñā prāpnoti*, ibid.

4.1 The addition of the word *śeṣa* in the rules *śeṣo ghy asakhi* (I. iv. 7) and *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* (II. ii. 23) is redundent in this school because the rule *ākaḍārād ekā saṃjñā* itself prevents the concourse of names.[27] In the case of *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* the word *śeṣa* is justified as referring to 'the triod of the nominative case-affixes'.[28] But in fact even without this interpretation the *bahuvrīhi* does not have any chance to operate along with *tatpuruṣa.* In the case of the other rule *śeṣo ghy asakhi* there cannot be any justification for the word *śeṣa.*

4.2 As Patañjali observes, the rule *sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau* (I ii. 64) and the other following rules of the *ekaśeṣa* topic are read immediately after the rule I. iv. 1 in the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra* section. He also observes that the word *eka* in I. iv. 2 is taken to the following rule by *anuvṛtti.*[29] The present position of the *ekaśeṣa* section in the second *pāda* of first *Adhyāya* might be due to the influence of the other version.

CONCLUSION

5.0 The above discussion may yield the following conclusions:

(1) The reason for the evolution of the two versions is a 'splenetic hankering after brevity'.[30] It is evident that the *Paraṃkārya-pakṣa* is an offshoot to eliminate the adoption of the principle of *anuvṛtti.* The attempts to critically examine the Paninian technic might have begun soon after it gained recognition and was introduced among the learned circles as an authority over the classical language. Such an appraisal might have led to the evolution of different versions.

(2) Even earlier to the composition of the *vārttikas* by Kātyāyana, two versions for the text of I. iv. to II. ii might have come into vogue, as the Vārttikakāra discusses the advantages as well as disadvan-

---

27. *ekā saṃjñeti pāṭhe tāvac cheṣasya grahaṇaṃ vyartham iti spaṣṭam eva,* ŚK. I. iv. 3, p. 99.
śeṣagrahaṇaṃ cintyaprayojanam. ekasaṃjñādhikārād eva hi stryākhyasya nīti nadīsaṃjñāpakṣe ghisaṃjñā na bhaviṣyati, P.M. I. iv. 7, p. 509.
also
ekasaṃjñādhikāre tv avyayībhāvasaṃjñaiva bādhiketi śeṣagrahaṇam anarthakam, ibid. I iv. 1, p. 489.

28. *trikas tarhi śeṣagrahaṇam, yasya trikasyānuktaḥ samāsaḥ sa śeṣaḥ, kasya, cānuktaḥ? prathamāyāḥ,* MB II. ii. 23, p. 199.

29. *mamāpi tarhy ekagrahaṇam parārtham bhaviṣyati – 'sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau' iti,* ibid. I. iv. 1, p. 272.

30. cf. *Paribhāṣā : arthamātrālāghavena putrotsavam manyante vaiyākaraṇāḥ.*

tages of both the versions. This may suggest that there was a long gap between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, although it is not clear which of the two versions is more acceptable to the Vārttikakāra.

(3) Patañjali accepts the version of the *Ekasaṃjñādhikārapakṣa* as more advantageous than the other. Nāgeśa observes that the version of the *Paraṃkārya-pakṣa* has been abandoned by Patañjali because it gives room for the undesirable concourse of *saṃjñās* in places like *unmattagaṅgam* and *ṛtviya*. Expressed otherwise, the *bahuvrīhi* cannot be prevented from the operation in the case of *avyayībhāva* compounds even when the word *śeṣa* is added to the rule II. ii. 23. In the case of th: derivation of the word *ṛtviya* the concourse of *pada* with *bha* cannot be averted.

(4) The later followers of Patañjali have followed suit and as such no serious attempt has been made to inquire into the text as handed down by Patañjali. Even though several amendations to the rules are suggested by some later grammarians, none of them is incoroporated in the text.[31]

31 For example Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita observes that the rule *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ* (I ii. 42) may be dropped and to get the same effect another rule as *karmadhārayaś ca* may be read at the end of the section of rules under the *adhikāra* of *samānādhikaraṇena* (ref. ŚK. I. iv. 1, p. 97). Haradatta refers to a suggestion of some thinkers that the word *karmadhāraya* may be included in the rule II. i. 23 as *dvigukarmadhārayau ca*, so that both the *dvigu* and *karmadhāraya* get the nomenclature *ta·puruṣa*. In such a case the rule I. ii. 42 is to be read after enunciating the rules of *karmadhāraya* as the rule II. i. 52 is read after II. i. 51 (ref. PM. I. ii. 42).

Dr. V.N. HARI RAO

A NOTE ON THE DATE OF VEDĀNTADEŚIKA

Our only source for an understanding of the date of Vedāntadeśika is the traditional account as enshrined in the *Guruparamparas*, the exactitude of which cannot be checked from independent sources. An attempt is made here to examine the allusions made in his account to known historical facts. Born in Kali 4370 or A.D. 1268 he grew-up to be a child prodigy and before his twentieth year he had mastered the *Vedānta* and *Prabanda* lore. He was soon chosen as the pontiff of the *Vaiṣṇava-maṭha* at Kanchipuram. Then he went to Tiruvahīndrapuram where he stayed for a few years and then returned to Kanchi. At his headquarters he stayed for a few years before he started on a religious tour of the sacred Vaiṣṇava shrines of the north. In the course of this tour he met Vidyāraṇya, the saint who is said to have blessed the foundation of Vijayanagar by Hjarihara and Bukka (A.D. 1336).

Subsequent to his return to Kanchipuram from his northern tour he was called upon to go over to Srirangam to meet the challenge of some skilled Advaitin debaters. This he did successfully and assumed, under divine command, the headship of the *Vaiṣṇava–maṭha* of Srirangam.

Vedāntadeśika's assumption of leadership at Srirangam must have happened soon after Malik Kafur's raid in A.D. 1310–11. In connection with his stay at Srirangam we are referred to only one Muslim invasion, and that was the one headed by Ulugh Khan in A.D. 1323. It could not have been the earlier invasion because, according to tradition, Vedāntadeśika was actively engaged in Srirangam for some years with the peaceful task of religious instruction and writing before he had to face the Muslim invasion and sack of the temple; and if this invasion were the one which occured in A.D. 1310–11 it is not possible to accommodate the period of his activetay at Srirangam between the year of of his assumption

of the pontificate in that shrine, which according to tradition took place sometime after his 40th year (say A.D. 1309 or 1310), and the invasion (i.e., A.D. 1311). Allowing about a few years for his active stay at Srirangam we get, assuming that the invasion he faced was that of A.D. 1310–11, the year A.D. 1300 for his assumption of the pontificate, i.e., in his 31st year. But according to well known tradition he was in Tiruvahīndrapuram and Kanchipuram in his 30th year, and after his stay in these places he undertook an extensive tour in the north. After his return to Kanchipuram he was called upon to defend Vaishnavism from the attacks of the *Māyāvādins* (Advitins) at Srirangam. His stay at Srirangam was not only active but profoundly fruitful. He carried on; at the same time, with considerable endurance and persistence the prodigious task of delivering religious lectures and writing out commentaries as well as original works both in Tamil and Sanskrit The long list of works contained in the traditional accounts could not have been the product of one or two years. Thus it is clear that the Muslim invasion that Deśika had to face was that of Ulugh Khan (A.D. 1323).

The period of Vedāntadeśika's exile from Srīrangam was a long one, i.e., from A.D. 1323 to 1371. During this period he was called upon to sit in judgment over the religious disputation between Vidyāraṇya and Akṣobya. As the debate is said to have been held in Vijayanagar Deśika might have proceeded to the capital from Satyamangalam or Melkote. As it is known that Akṣobhya had occupied the Madhva pontifical seat between the years A.D. 1350 and 1367 it may reasonably be presumed that Deśika's arbitration, referred to by the *Vaibhava-prakāśikā* must have taken place sometime between these two dates.

According to the *Vaḍakalai* tradition, as noticed by the *Prapannāmṛtam*, the verses of Gopanārya's inscription in the Srirangam temple (deted Śaka 1293, A.D. 1371) dealing with the restoration were composed by Vedāntadeśika, who returned to Srirangam from his exile and witnessed in great delight the reconsecration of the images. The *Guruparampara* says that Vedāntadeśika breathed his last in Kali 4470 or A.D. 1368. Laying too much emphasis on the traditional dates (which credit Deśika with a life of exactly a century, i.e., from Kali 4370 to 4470) some scholars have questioned the date of this inscription, nay the validity of the epigraph itself, which is said to be unusual in character. Vedāntadeśika, who died in A.D. 1368, we are told, could not have witnessed the reconsecration and composed the verses in praise of Gopana in A.D. 1371. Hence the restoration of the temple must have taken place sometime before A.D. 1369.[1] Clearly it is not valid to question the inscription

1. *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XXIV, p. 308. f.n. 2.

and its date on the basis of tradition. Either Vedāntadeśika did not compose the verses or he died sometime after A.D. 1371. The latter is the more probable alternative. Subsequent to the restoration Vedāntadeśika settled, according to tradition, once again in Srirangam and spent a few years in peaceful religious activity before his death, during which period he wrote his *Rahasyatrayasāra*, elaborately explaining the doctrine of *prapatti*. For the sake of convenience we may assume that Vedāntadeśika died in A.D. 1380; and striking to tradition, which credits him with a hundred years, his life may be said to have extended from A.D. 1280 to 1380.

Dr. K. RAJAYYAN

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CASTE SYSTEM AMONG THE SOUTHERN TAMILS AT THE BEGINNING OF MODERN TIMES

The present paper represents an attempt to depict the caste system as it worked among the people of the southern region of Tamilnadu during the eighteenth century.

The period was marked by the absence of any regular government. In consequence valour and strength offered the scope to one caste to elevate itself above the other. This inevitably attracted the castes, prone to violence, to the profession of arms, and left others to cultivate the arts of peace. The Marawas, Kallans and Totiens, the three warlike communities belonged to the former category, while the other castes, especially the Brahmins, Vellalars, Nadars and Parayas to the latter. The armed groups were essentially aggressive in their outlook but the peace loving groups were defensive.

The Marawas, fierce and warlike, formed the dominant people in Ramnad and Sivaganga. Trained for war and plunder, they marched against the villages of other inhabitants, attacked them mercilessly and exacted tributes. They considered it a disgrace to possess soft womanly hands, to bear no scars of deep and ghastly sword thrusts, to remain ignorant of the use of bow and arrow and to eat food, which their own hands honestly procured. True to this conviction, they struck terror and awe wherever their raiding spirit carried them. Serving in the armed establishments of the local rulers, they held a status like that of the Rajputs in Rajputana. The Marawas worshipped Siva and numerous devils of whom Cudalai Madan was the most conspicuous.[1]

---

1. Rev. T.B. Pandyan, *Ancient Heroes of South Indian Peninsula*, p. 19.

The Kallans, another warlike community, inhabited largely in Pudukkottai, Nattam and Melur. The inhabitants of Pudukkottai took pride in agricultural pursuits but those of Nattam and Melur did not hesitate to commit any sort of excess and cruelty. Their boys of the age between ten and twelve displayed an extraordinary propensity for thieving. When they reached the age of fifteen, they were considered proficient in carrying off an object that tempted them. Some religious ceremonies were then performed, the hair was allowed to grow and the boy was presented with a young woman in marriage as a reward for his daring interpidity in robbery. The Kallans, as they were so trained, robbed the merchants and plundered the villages. However, they permitted the travellers to insure against robbery by paying a certain fee to any member of their tribe. In that case a young Kallar girl would conduct the traveller through their territory to safety. She would keep her finger on her ear, which was the sign to the other Kallans to observe restraint. Still if any, unable to resist their temptation, robbed the traveller, she would tear her ear lap immediately and report the matter to the leader of the tribe. The chief, thereupon, would summon the guilty to his council, impose a fine and tear off their ear laps in expiation of their crime.

The Totiens, also called as Kambalatars, were Telugus by descent. Mostly, they had settled in the plains of eastern Tirunelveli. Though warlike, they possessed a strong inclination to obtain property in land. In general they were Vaishnavites, but the different families had their own household deities. The members of this community settled their disputes through their jury.[2]

By virtue of their profession the Brahmins held a high status in the society. As it was the traditional practice, they officiated at Hindu worship, temple ceremonies and marriage functions, blessed the homes and purified the unclean. Added to these, they indicated lucky days for undertaking a work, drew the horoscope of the infants and warded off the curses haunting them. Better educated than the other communal groups, the Brahmins displayed an inclination to serve in the administration too.[3]

The Vellalars and the Nadars were mostly peasants. A numerous section, the Vellalars spoke a pure dialect of Tamil, took interest in agriculture and distinguished as soldiers and administrators. The

2. B.S. Ward, *Geographical and Statistical Memoirs of the Provinces of Madura and Dindigul,* vol. 3, pp. 1–11.
3. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies,* vol. 1, pp. 135–6.

Nadars were mostly found in Tirunelveli and Ramnad. They engaged themselves in cultivation, trade and toddy tapping. As the Vellalars did, they worshipped Śiva but in the place of the Brahmins their barbers officiated at their social functions. Though many of them embraced Christianity, they did not allow their religious differences to disturb their communal harmony.[4]

The Parayas and Pallers were the field workers and the Parawas were the fishermen. In spite of the great services that they did to the society, they were so detested that they were treated as untouchables, beaten by the caste-Hindus at pleasure and compelled to reside outside the towns. Nevertheless they too had their own sub-castes, some of which claiming superiority over the rest. In addition to these castes there were artisans called Panchalas, washermen, barbers and the nomadic tribes. The Kuravas were the wandering traders and fortune tellers. Each tribe of them having its distinct customs and habits and governed by an elected chief constituted an independent republic.

The prominence claimed by some castes by virtue of their attitude towards violence and superiority assumed by some others on ground of birth kept alive a diversity of social customs and habits. This on the one hand rendered certain sections of the population aggressive and on the other left the inferior groups downtrodden. An interplay of these factors accounted for the evils in the social set up.

The importance given to the profession of arms led some communities to consider themselves more destined for warfare than for the cultivation of the arts of peace. They looked upon a martial career for seeking their fortune. As they neglected the finer aspects of life, they lived in a state of ignorance. Even on every trifling occasion their disposition seemed prone to quarrels, often terminating in blood. They practised the law of retaliation very strictly. The Marawas and the Kallans in particular possessed an aptitude to maintain with violence an opinion once formed, whether it was right or wrong. No wonder, the British administrators entertained a view that they could at the most be driven but could not be led.[5] Another ostensible tendency was to consider large sections of the people as socially inferior. The contempt with which they were treated was carried to that extent as to believe that their presence or even their foot prints contaminated the surrounding area. For instance a member of a community that was considered low was forbidden from going to a Brahmin locality. Should

4. H.R. Pate (ed.), *Gazetteer of Tinnevelly*, vol 1. pp. 129-131.
5. *Madras Coun il*, Revenue Consultations dated 14 December 1798.

he do so the Brahmin had the right to inflict severe punishment. It was considered a total contamination to eat food prepared by a member of the so called low caste or to eat with him or to drink water brought by him, to use a vessel held by him or to set foot inside his house. The contaminated person lost his caste. There was provision for remedy, which consisted of elaborate ceremonies dominated by a series of baths. So much was the obsession in the preservation of purity that the caste Hindus wasted their time and left the intruders free to assert their political authority and practice tyranny over the country.

Indeed the society functioned under numerous limitations. Mutual hatred and suspicion led to internal dissensions and external interventions. The habit to view the things through the angle of caste discouraged new thoughts and new enterprises. The absence of freedom to take up a career of one's instinct contributed to economic stagnation. A conviction that they were born in subordination and as inferior to others was so strongly ingrained in the minds of the people, who felt themselves low, that it never occurred to them that their fate was anything but irrevocable.[6] A total want of adventure and enterprise in consequence marked their outlook. This ruled out the possibility of any improvement of the condition of the population.

6. Dubois, op. cit. pp. 50–59.

SRI D.T. TATACHARYA

परज्ञानजिज्ञासा

'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः' इति तावत् दृष्टोपकारकतया रागप्राप्तश्रवणमनननानुवादपूर्वकं दर्शनसमानाकारत्वरूपगुणविशिष्टं ध्यानं अपवर्गोपायतया विधीयत इति भगवद्भाष्यकारसिद्धान्तः। स्मृतेः मुख्यप्रत्यक्षजनकत्व-स्यादृष्टत्वात् शास्त्रेणाबोधनाच्च अपवर्गोपायतया श्रुतं दर्शनं न मुख्यं, अपि तु दर्शन-समानाकारस्मरणरूपं गौणं दर्शनमिति सर्वैराचार्यैरवधृतम्। योगिप्रत्यक्षमङ्गीक्रियत एव। परं तु स्वयं फलभूतं तत्, न त्वपवर्गोपायभूतम्। अपवर्गोपायभूतध्यानजन्यं तु प्रत्यक्षं विशदतमस्मरणरूपमेव, न तु मुख्यम्। बहुषु स्थलेषु इदं स्पष्टीकृतं आचार्यचरणैः —

'ध्यानसाध्यतयोक्तं दर्शनं मुमुक्षोश्चेत् विशदध्यानरूपं स्यात्'

इति तत्त्वटीकायाम्।

'ततश्च वैशद्यातिशयविवक्षया शास्त्रजन्यज्ञाने वा तन्मूलोपास-नात्मकज्ञाने वा दर्शनवाचो युक्तिः। समाधिविशेषफलभूतस्तु अद्यतन-साक्षात्कारः उपायत्वेनाभिहितत्वात् नात्र संशयनीयः। मोक्षोपयोप-देशपरेषु सर्वेषु वाक्येषु दर्शनशब्द उपासनपर इति शारीरकभाष्ये प्रत्यपादि।'

इति ईशावास्यभाष्ये।

'भक्तिरूपेणोपासनेनोपास्यमानोऽहं तदानीमेवोपा-सितुः प्रत्यक्षतामुपगतो भवामीत्यर्थः।'

इति गीतानवमाध्याय द्वितीयश्लोक भाष्यावतारिकायाम् ।

> 'नन्विदमयुक्तम् । उपासनस्य स्मृतिसन्ततिरूपत्वात् उपास्यस्य चाप्रत्यक्षत्वश्रुतेः । प्रत्यक्षस्य तु विषयान्तरस्य भक्तावनन्वयात् इत्यत्राह — भक्तिरूपेणेति । 'भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्यः' इत्यादिकमिह भाव्यम् ।'

इति तात्पर्यचन्द्रिकायाम् । अयं भावः — अपवर्गोपायभूतोपासनात्मकभक्तिजन्यप्रत्यक्षस्येह विवक्षितत्वात् दर्शनसमानाकारस्मृतिविषयत्वमेव प्रत्यक्षत्वमिति । तस्मात् मोक्षोपायभूतोपासनजन्यं मुख्यं प्रत्यक्षं नास्तीति स्थितमेतत् । अथापि दर्शनसमानाकारे स्मृतिसन्ताने गौणतयैव प्रत्यक्षशब्दं साक्षात्कारशब्दं वा बहुलं प्रयुञ्जते श्रीभाष्यकारादयः सर्वे आचार्याः । तत्र मुख्यार्थताबुद्धिः क्वचिदपि न कार्या ।

इदमुपासनं अष्टाङ्गयोगरूपमेवाभिमतमाचार्याणाम् । तत्र यमनियमौ शान्तो दान्तः नाविरतो दुश्चरितात्, वेदानुवचनेन यज्ञेन दानेन, शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात् इत्यादिभिः सिद्धावेव । आसनमपि 'आसीनः संभवात्' इति । प्राणायामो यद्यपि हठयोग इव श्वासजयपर्यन्तोऽपेक्षित इत्यत्र न किञ्चित्प्रमाणमस्ति तथापि सर्वकर्माङ्गतया प्राणायामसङ्कल्पयोर्विहितत्वात् साधारणः प्राणायामः प्राप्त एव । विहितस्य ध्यानस्य एकाग्रतां विना दुष्करत्वात् तदर्थं बाह्येन्द्रियजयरूपः प्रत्याहारः, अध्यवसिते विषये मनसः स्थिरस्थापनात्मिका धारणा च आक्षिप्येते । एतैः षड्भिरङ्गैः साध्यं परतत्त्वध्यानात्मकं सप्तमं योगाङ्गं निदिध्यासितव्यः 'कारणं तु ध्येयः' इत्यादिभिः अपवर्गोपायतया विहितम् । ध्यानं स्मृतिसन्ततिः । स्मृतिसन्ततीनां मध्ये विजातीयप्रत्ययेन व्यवधानपरिहारार्थं ध्रुवा स्मृतिरिति ध्रुवत्वेन स्मृतिर्विशेष्यते ।

द्रष्टव्य इति विहितं दर्शनसमानाकारत्वं फलरूपं न साक्षात् पुरुषप्रयत्नेन संपादयितुं शक्यते । अतस्तत्र तत् फलं येन भवेत् तद्विधाने तात्पर्यम् । इदं स्पष्टं श्रुतप्रकाशिकायाम् —

> 'विशदतरत्वस्य फलरूपत्वात् अपुरुषतन्त्रस्य कथं विधानमिति चेन्न । आज्यावेक्षणस्येव विधानोपपत्तेः । तत्राज्यसाक्षात्कारहेतुभूत-

> व्यापारविषयो विधिरिति चेत् इहापि विशदतरत्वावहस्मृतिसन्तति-
> विषयमनोव्यापारविधिरित्युपपन्नम् ।'

इति । अयं भावः — प्रथमैः षड्भिरङ्गैर्निर्वर्तिते अपवर्गोपायभूते ध्याने प्रवृत्तः मुमुक्षुः आदावेव धारणासिद्धिजनितपाटवविशेषवता मनसा ततः प्राक्तनयत्किञ्चिद्विषय-स्मृत्यपेक्षया विलक्षणामेव स्मृतिसन्ततिं कुर्यात् । अथापि सः यतः परं वैशद्यातिशयो न सम्भाव्यते तादृशमात्यन्तिकं विशदतमत्वं कामयमानः उपास्यविषये तथा मनो व्यापारयेत् यथा तेन व्यापारेण जायमाना स्मृतिः अव्यवहितपूर्वस्मृत्यपेक्षया कञ्चनातिशयं लभेत । एवं पूर्वपूर्वस्मृत्यपेक्षया उत्तरोत्तरस्मृतिः अतिशयवती भवति । उत्तरोत्तरं प्रकृष्यमाणोऽयमतिशय एव चिरात् वैशद्यपदाभिधेयो भवति । दर्शनसमानाकारस्यैव ध्यानस्य उपायतया विहितत्वात् तस्य तादृशत्वे इच्छा तदनुकूलो व्यापारश्च मुमुक्षो-रवश्यम्भाविनौ । अतः प्रत्यहं वर्धमानः स्मृतिसन्तानः अन्ततः काष्ठागतं वैशद्यं भजते । अस्यां दशायां अयं साक्षात्कार इति व्यवह्रियते । समाधिरिति च । ततः पूर्वं ध्यानरूपसप्तमाङ्गमात्रं स्थितम् । समाधिरष्टमाङ्गम् । स्पष्टमिदम् —

> 'मनसा ध्याननिष्पाद्यं समाधिः सोऽभिधीयते' इति समा-धेर्ध्याननिष्पाद्यत्वोक्तिश्च विशदा विशदवैषम्यात् । उक्तं चावस्थाद्वयं तस्यैव योगाङ्गत्वमङ्गित्वं च निर्वहद्भिः । ....अतः 'तस्मिन् दृष्टे' इत्यपवर्गोपायविषयेण स्मृतेर्वैशद्यलाभात् तादृशी सैव समाधिरिति नाष्टमलोपप्रसंगश्चेति ।'

इति तत्त्वटीकाग्रन्थश्रीसूक्त्या । इत्थमुपायतया विहितायां स्मृतौ विशदाविशदभेदात् द्वैविध्यं

> 'भवति च भावनाप्रकर्षात् स्मृतेर्दर्शनरूपता ।'

इति श्रीभाष्य एव व्यञ्जितम् । भावनाया अप्रकर्षावस्थाज्ञापनात् ।

अस्याः ध्रुवस्मृतेः भक्तित्वापादकं प्रीतिरूपापन्नत्वमपि विशेषणम् । विषयस्य सकलकल्याणगुणाकरस्य भगवतः अत्यर्थप्रियत्वेन तत्स्मरणमपि अत्यन्तं प्रियं भवति । स्वयमेव प्रीतिरूपं भवति । महनीयविषये प्रीतिरेव भक्तिः । अतो ध्रुवानुस्मृतेः भक्ति-योगत्वम् । भक्त्या परमपुरुषप्राप्तिरूपो मोक्षो भवतीति गीता वदति —

'पुरुषः स परः पार्थ भक्त्या लभ्यस्त्वनन्यया'

इति । न परमेवं परमपुरुषप्राप्तिः, अपि तु ज्ञानदर्शने अपि भक्त्या प्राप्येते इत्यपि तत्रोच्यते –

'भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्यः अहमेवंविधोऽर्जुन ।
ज्ञातुं द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन प्रवेष्टुं च परन्तप ॥'

इति । अत्र शास्त्रजन्यं ज्ञानं ज्ञातुमित्युक्तम् । शास्त्रार्थज्ञानं भगवद्भक्तिं विना यथावद् दुरधिगमम् । 'यस्य देवे परा भक्ति'रिति श्रवणात् । द्रष्टुमिति द्रष्टव्य इति विहितं यद् गौणं दर्शनं तदुच्यते । मुख्यसाक्षात्कारस्य परमात्मविषयकस्य असंभवात् । 'न सन्दृशे तिष्ठती'ति श्रुतेः । अर्जुनस्येव अपवर्गार्थभक्तियोगनिष्ठानां दिव्यं चक्षुर्ददाति भगवानित्यत्र प्रमाणाभावात् । प्रवेष्टुमिति मोक्षः । अत्र 'भक्त्या' इति सामान्यतः अभिधानेऽपि शास्त्रजन्यज्ञानहेतुतयाऽभिप्रेता भक्तिः 'यस्य देवे' 'आचार्यदेवो भव' इत्यादिभिर्विहिता अन्या । दर्शनप्रवेशहेतुतयाऽभिप्रेता तु, निदिध्यासितव्यः, द्रष्टव्यः, उपासीत इत्यादिभिर्विहितानां ध्यानादीनां विश्रान्तिभूमिभूता भक्तिः अन्या योगरूपा इति ज्ञेयम् । इयं परभक्तिरित्युच्यते । 'समः सर्वेषु भूतेषु मद्भक्तिं लभते पराम्' इति गीतानुसारात् । 'प्रतिलभ्य परां भक्तिं' इति श्रीगीतार्थसंग्रहे । इयं परा भक्तिरित्युक्ते अन्या अवरा भक्तिरस्तीति ज्ञायते । का सा इत्यपेक्षायां मोक्षसाधनीभूता योगरूपा च येयं भक्तिः ततः प्राक्तनी आचार्योपसदनशास्त्रार्थाधिगमादिहेतुभूता या सेति प्रतीयते ।

'ध्रुवानुस्मृत्यपेक्षया प्राक्तनी या भक्तिः तद्व्यवच्छेदार्था मोक्षोपायत्वोक्तिः'

इति श्रीसारास्वादिनी श्रीसूक्तिरिहानुसन्धेया । साक्षान्मोक्षसाधनत्वाभावेन निकृष्टामिमां भक्तिमपेक्ष्य उपायभूता भक्तिः परा भक्तिरिति स्फुटमत्र आचार्या उपपादयन्ति । परभक्तेः दर्शनसमानाकारत्वात्मकप्रत्यक्षतापत्तिः चरमा परिपाकावस्था । स्पष्टमिदम् –

'भगवद्गुणविभूतिज्ञानस्य भक्त्युत्पत्तिविवृद्धिहेतुत्वमुक्तम् । तथाविधविवृद्धभक्तेः भगवत्प्राप्तिपूर्वभाविविशदतम साक्षात्काररूपावस्था विशेषहेतुत्वं भगवत्प्रसादावान्तरव्यापारकमुच्यते – तेषामिति ।'

इति 'तेषां सततयुक्तानां' इति गीताश्लोकभाष्यावतारिकया ।

'ददामि बुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते' इत्युक्तरीत्या प्राप्तये व्यवधानरहितपरभक्तिदशोत्पादनं च' ।

इति उपकारसंग्रहद्वितीयाधिकारश्रीसूक्त्या च । प्रसेदुषस्तस्यापवर्गाव्यवहितहेतुभूत-बुद्धियोगादि प्रदानेऽन्येषामिव परापेक्षत्वं नास्तीति व्यक्तये स्वयमेवेत्युक्तमिति तत्त्वटीका-सूक्तिरप्यत्र भाव्या ।

'भक्त्या मामभिजानाति यावान् यश्चास्मि तत्त्वतः ।
ततो मां तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा विशते तदनन्तरम् ॥'

इति गीताश्लोकः 'तत्फलमाह' इति भाष्येऽवतारितः । तच्छब्देन 'स्वस्वामिन्यत्यर्थ-प्रियानुभवरूपां परां भक्तिं लभते' इति पूर्वोक्ता परभक्तिः परामृश्यते । अत्र तात्पर्य-चन्द्रिका – 'तत्फलमाहेति । अव्यवहितं व्यवहितं चेति शेषः' इति । अव्यवहितं फलं मामभिजानातीत्युक्तं ज्ञानम् । व्यवहितं 'विशते तदनन्तरं' इत्युक्तः प्रवेशः । एवं मोक्षोपायभक्तिजन्यत्वेनोक्तं इदं ज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षतापन्नः साक्षात्काररूपः इति तत्र-तत्रोक्तः वैशद्यकाष्ठां प्राप्तः स्मृतिसन्तान एव, द्रष्टव्य इति विध्यनुरोधात् । मुख्य-साक्षात्कारस्य प्रसंगाभावात् । अत एव –

'मां तत्त्वतोऽभिजानातीत्युक्तस्यैव मां तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा इत्यनु-भाषणं उपायभूतस्यापि स्वादुतमतया सुदुर्लभत्वेनादरातिशयार्थम् ।'

इति तात्पर्यचन्द्रिकायामस्य ज्ञानस्योपायभूतत्वोक्तिः न हि मुख्यसाक्षात्कारः उपायः । 'तेषां सततयुक्तानां' इति श्लोकमुदाहरता भगवता भाष्यकृता –

'यथायं प्रियतमः आत्मानं प्राप्नोति तथा
स्वयमेव भगवान् प्रयतत इति भगवतैवोक्तम् ।'

इति यदुक्तं तेनास्मिन् श्लोके उक्तो बुद्धियोगः दर्शनसमानाकारा स्मृतिरेवेति तदभिप्राय इति स्पष्टम् ।

'मत्प्राप्त्यनुगुणोपासनविपाकं तद्विरोधिनिरसनं
अत्यर्थमत्प्रियत्वादिकं च अहमेव ददामीत्यर्थः ।'

इति गीताष्टमाध्याय चतुर्दशश्लोक भाष्यसूक्त्यापि तथा । 'भक्त्या मामभिजानाती'ति-श्लोकभाष्ये –

'तं मामेवंरूपया भक्त्या तत्त्वतोऽभिजानाति ।
तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा तदनन्तरं तत्त्वज्ञानानन्तरं
मां विशते प्रविशति ।'

इति भाषणेनापि 'परभक्त्या जायमानं ज्ञानमुपायभूतम् । अत एव तत् गौणसाक्षात्कार-रूपम्' इत्यसंदिग्धं ज्ञायते ।

'तेषां सततयुक्तानां मयि सततयोगमाशंसमानानां तमेव बुद्धि-योगं विपाकदशापन्नं प्रीतिपूर्वकं ददामि, येन ते मामुपयान्ति ।'

इति गीताभाष्यश्रीसूक्तौ विपाकदशापन्नमित्येतत् अत्यन्तमवधेयम् ।

इदमत्र विवक्षितम् । प्रीतिरूपापन्नतया भक्तिशब्दाभिधेयतां गता अप-वर्गोपायतया परभक्तिशब्दाभिधेया च ध्रुवा स्मृतिः यावत् प्रत्यक्षत्वापादक-वैशद्यातिशयरूपं विपाकं न गता तावत् भक्तियोगे ध्यानशब्दाभिधेयं सप्तममङ्गं भवति । तत्प्राप्तौ सैव समाधिरूपमष्टममङ्गं भवति । समाधिरेव साक्षादपवर्गहेतुः । एतद्द्वारा ध्यानम् । न च हेतुहेतुत्वादन्यथासिद्धिः । निदिध्यासितव्य इति विहि-तत्वात् । न हि पुरोडाशद्वारा यागहेतवो व्रीहयः अहेतवो भवन्ति । व्रीहिभिर्यजेतेति विधेः । न च परम्परया साधनममुख्यसाधनं भवति । विधिना मुख्यत्वावगमात् इति ।

यदिदं ध्यानजन्यं विशदतमतया प्रत्यक्षतापन्नं समाधिरूपं ज्ञानं तत् शास्त्रजन्य-ज्ञानापेक्षया उत्कृष्टत्वात् परभक्तिन्यायेन परज्ञानाभिधेयं मेने तथा व्यवहरति च भगवान् भाष्यकारः । न परमेतावत् । परज्ञाने जाते योगिनः सद्यो भगवत्प्राप्तौ तीव्रोऽभि-निवेशो जायते । अस्यामवस्थायां समाधिमेव परमभक्तिमाह भगवान् भाष्यकारः । उपक्रमात्प्रभृति आ प्रयाणादनुवर्तमाना ध्रुवा स्मृतिरिति उपासनमिति चाभिधीयमाना विद्या एकैव । तथापि वैशद्यापेक्षया परज्ञानमिति प्राप्तौ विलम्बाक्षमत्वापादकतया परम-भक्तिरिति च विपाकावस्थायां व्यवहारे क्रियमाणे परमभक्तिरिति व्यवहारः ततः प्राक्तनावस्थामात्रे व्यवतिष्ठते । तथा चावस्थाभेदेन एकस्या एव विद्यायाः तिस्रः समाख्याः परभक्तिः परज्ञानं परमभक्तिरिति । तिस्रोऽप्येता अवस्थाः भक्तियोगनिष्ठस्य

सर्वस्य मुमुक्षोः उपासने नियता भवन्ति । 'सर्वकर्माण्यपि सदा कुर्वाणो मद्व्यपाश्रयः' इत्यष्टादशाध्यायश्लोकावतारिकायां एवं भाष्यते ।

> 'एवं वर्णाश्रमोचितनित्यनैमित्तिककर्मणां परित्यक्तफलादिकानां परमपुरुषाराधनरूपाणामनुष्ठितानां विपाक उक्तः ।'

इति । तत्र तात्पर्यचन्द्रिका – 'विपाकोऽत्र पूर्वश्लोकद्वयोक्तपरभक्तिपरज्ञानपरमभक्तिपर्यन्तः' इति । आसामवस्थानां मिथो वैलक्षण्यं च 'भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्य' इति श्लोकतात्पर्यचन्द्रिकायां प्रादर्शि –

> 'उत्कटदिदृक्षागर्भा तु परभक्तिः साक्षात्कारहेतुः । साक्षात्कृते तु परिपूर्णानुभवाभिनिवेशलक्षणा परमभक्तिः प्रवेशहेतुः ।'

इति । अत्र उत्कटदिदृक्षागर्भा परभक्तिरुक्ता । न तु दर्शनरूपतामापन्नेत्यवधेयम् । परभक्तिहेतुकत्वेनोक्तः साक्षात्कारो न मुख्यः अपि तु औपचारिकः । विशदतमत्वेन दर्शनसमानाकारतां प्राप्ता स्मृतिरेवेत्यपि अधस्तात् कृतैर्निरूपणैः सुगमम् । अयमेव परज्ञानमित्यपि तथा ।

एवं हेतुहेतुमद्भावप्रतिपादनावसरे व्यवस्थया व्यवहारे क्रियमाणेऽपि परमभक्तित्वावस्थायां निष्पन्नायां उपायस्य ज्ञानत्वध्यानत्वोपासनत्ववत् परभक्तित्वपरज्ञानत्वे अपि स्त एव । अतो ज्ञानान्मोक्षः ध्यानान्मोक्ष इतिवत् परभक्तेर्मोक्षः परज्ञानान्मोक्षः इत्यपि मुख्य एव व्यवहारः । तेन 'मोक्षोपायतया विहितो भक्तियोगः परभक्तिरित्यभिहितः' इत्यादि श्रीमद्रहस्यत्रयसाराद्युक्तेः 'एवं यथाधिकारं परिगृहीतैस्त्रिभिः आत्मावलोकनसिद्धिद्वारा परमभक्त्युत्पादनप्रकारं परमभक्तेरेव प्रकृष्टायाः परमप्राप्तिसाधनत्वं च दर्शयति – निरस्तेति' इति श्रीगीतार्थसंग्रहरक्षोक्तेश्च न विरोध इति ज्ञेयम् ।

उक्तं सर्वं विशदीकुर्वतीः व्यासार्याणां तात्पर्यदीपिकापङ्क्तीरुदाहरामः –

> 'यद्वा पूर्वमपि ध्यानशब्देनाविच्छिन्नस्मृतिसन्ततिरूपध्यानमेवोच्यते । न तु आरम्भणसंशीलनम् । पश्चात् अनुध्यानशब्देन दिव्यात्मस्वरूपानुसन्धानरूपः समाधिरुच्यते । स हि ध्यानसाध्यः ।

'तस्यैव कल्पनाहीनं स्वरूपग्रहणं हि यत् ।
मनसा ध्याननिष्पाद्यं समाधिः सोऽभिधीयते ॥'

इति वचनात् ।........ धारणापर्यन्तानां अङ्गानां ध्याननिष्पादकत्ववत् ध्यानस्य समाधिनिष्पादकत्वमेवेति समाधेरेवाङ्गित्वम् । ध्यानस्यैव प्राधान्यं यत्रोच्यते तत्र ध्यानशब्देन समाधिपर्यन्तध्यानं विवक्षितम् ।

ध्येयस्य निरतिशयप्रियत्वात् ध्याने प्रीतिः । ध्यानदशायां प्रीतिः । ध्यानस्य प्रीतिरूपत्वमुक्तं भवति । एवं वरणीयत्वहेतुर्गुण उक्तः । तत्र प्रमाणमाह — यथोक्तमिति । 'भक्त्या मामभिजानाति' इत्यादिश्लोके भक्तिसाध्यं ज्ञानान्तरं अपवर्गोपाय इति शङ्का मा भूदिति तद् व्याचष्टे — तदनन्तरमिति । 'भक्त्या' इति परभक्तिरुच्यते । 'मद्भक्तिं लभते परां' इति प्रकृतत्वात् । 'अभिजानाति' इति परज्ञानमुच्यते ।.... तत इति परमभक्तिरुच्यते । साक्षात्काराभिनिवेशः परभक्तिः । साक्षात्कारः परज्ञानम् । पश्चादनुभवाभिनिवेशः परमभक्तिः ।.... परभक्तिरूपज्ञानविशेषस्येति परज्ञानात् पूर्वभाविनी परभक्तिर्न विवक्षिता । परमभक्तिरेवाभिप्रेता । ज्ञानपूर्वककर्मानुगृहीतः अहरहरभ्यस्यमानो भक्तियोगः परमभक्तेरुत्पादक इत्यर्थः । अहरहरभ्यस्यमान एव भक्तियोगः परमभक्तिदशापन्नः स्यादित्यर्थः । प्रीतिरूपध्यानेन निरतिशयानन्दरूप दिव्यात्मस्वरूपानुसन्धानं निरतिशयप्रियं सिद्ध्यति । तदेव साक्षात्काररूपानुभवाभिनिवेशं जनयति । सोऽभिनिवेशः परमभक्तिरिति यावत् ।

अत्र दिव्यात्मस्वरूपानुसन्धानमिति परज्ञानमुक्तम् । साक्षात्काररूपानुभवेति मुक्तिकालानुभवोक्तिः । तदेवं दर्शनसमानाकारत्वदशां प्राप्ता परभक्तिरेव परज्ञानम् । इयमेव परभक्तिः परिपूर्णानुभवाभिनिवेशवती परमभक्तिरिति श्रीभाष्यकृतां व्यासार्याणां श्रीदेशिकचरणानां च सिद्धान्तः । अथापि केचित् विद्वांसः श्रीमद्रहस्यत्रयसारश्रीसूक्तिमाश्रित्य अन्यथा मन्यन्ते ।

'शुद्धभावं गतो भक्त्या शास्त्राद्वेद्मि जनार्दनं'

इत्युक्तरीत्या शास्त्रजन्यतत्त्वज्ञानकर्मयोगादिपरम्परया उत्पन्ना परभक्तिः साक्षात्काराभिनिवेशमुत्पाद्य 'योगेश्वर ततो मे त्वं दर्शयात्मानमव्ययम् । यथा मे त्वद्दर्शनं स्यात् तथा कृपां कुरु । सकृद्दर्शनाय आयाहि' इति विलापं कारयित्वा एतदपेक्षामात्रहेतुकभगवत्प्रसादविशेषेण तत्काल-नियतं परिपूर्णसाक्षात्कारमुत्पादयेत् । अयं साक्षात्कारः परज्ञानमित्युक्तः ।'

इत्येषा सा श्रीसूक्तिः । अत्र पूर्णसाक्षात्कारं मुख्यसाक्षात्कारं मन्यन्ते । श्री सारा-स्वादिनीस्वरसोऽप्येवम् । अपवर्गोपायः ध्रुवा स्मृतिरेव । तत्र मुख्यसाक्षात्कारस्य का प्रसक्तिरिति चेत् अयं साक्षात्कारो वा एतज्जन्या परमभक्तिर्वा न साधनमपवर्गस्येति केचित् । परज्ञानमेव न साधनम् । परमभक्तिः साधनमेवेत्यपरे ।

अत्रेदं वक्तव्यम् । अनुपायत्वे उपायविभागाधिकारे नानयोर्निरूपणस्य संगतिः । नहि योगिप्रत्यक्षमिह निरूप्यते । उपायत्वं उपपाद्यते च श्रीसारास्वादिन्याम् । अतः तत्कालनियतं पूर्णसाक्षात्कारमिति भक्तियोगनिष्ठस्य अपवर्गसाधनतया तदनुष्ठानकाले परिपाकदशायां जायमानतया व्यवस्थापितः द्रष्टव्य इति विहितो यः साक्षात्कारः औपचा-रिकः, तमेव आचार्यचरणा विवक्षन्तीति प्रतिपत्तव्यम् । अन्यथा बहवो दोषाः । तथा हि — अपवर्गोपायभक्तियोगनिष्ठस्य मध्ये मुख्यसाक्षात्कारो भवतीत्यत्र न किञ्चित् प्रमाणमस्ति । न हि प्रमाणं विना स्वयमेव किञ्चिद्वदेयुराचार्याः । प्रत्युत स्मृतेः प्रत्यक्ष-जनकत्वं प्रमाणविरुद्धम् । परभक्त्या साक्षात्कराभिनिवेशो जायते । अयमभिनिवेशः साक्षात्कारं जनयतीति चेत् अत्र किं प्रमाणम् । कथं तर्हि 'एतदपेक्षामात्रहेतुक-भगवत्प्रसादविशेषेण' इत्याचार्या वदन्तीति चेत्

'तेषां सततयुक्तानां भजतां प्रीतिपूर्वकम् ।
ददामि बुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते ॥'

इति प्रमाणानुरोधादिति सुगमम् । भक्तियोगनिष्ठो हि भगवतोऽत्यन्तं प्रियः । तेन तस्य यथाकालं तं तमनुग्रहं कर्तुं जागरूको भगवान् स्वकीयस्योपासनस्य प्रमाणसिद्ध-दर्शनसमानाकारत्वसिद्धिं आदितः प्रभृति कामयमानो भक्तः यदा तत्राभिनिवेशव्यप-देशार्हां उत्कटामिच्छां करोति तदा तस्य योगं ध्यानावस्थातः समाध्यवस्थां प्रापयति । समाधिः दर्शनसमानाकारं ध्यानम् । औपचारिकः पूर्णः साक्षात्कारः ।

अपि चापवर्गोपायो भक्तियोग ईदृश इति यो न जानाति स तत्र नाधिकारी। यस्तु जानाति स मध्ये किमर्थं उपायानन्तर्गतं मुख्यसाक्षात्कारमपेक्षेत। स्वापेक्षामात्रेण भगवान् स्वविषयं मुख्यसाक्षात्कारं दास्यतीति कथं स जानाति। न हि तत्र किञ्चित् प्रमाणमस्ति। न चाजानतस्तत्र इच्छा भवेत्। 'ज्ञातुं द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन भक्त्या मामभिजानाति' इत्यादि तु तत्र न प्रमाणमिति प्रागेव सुनिरूपितम्।

किञ्च मुख्यसाक्षात्कारे सति स्मृतेर्ध्रुवत्वं भज्येत। समानविषयत्वान्न भङ्ग इति न वाच्यम्। स्मृतिस्वरूपस्यैव नाशात्। एवं

'प्रमाणविरहादिच्छामात्रस्याहेतुभावतः।
असम्भवाच्च विच्छेदान्न साक्षात्कारमुख्यता॥
अतो दर्शनतुल्यं यत्स्मरणं श्रुतिचोदितम्।
तदेवेष्टं परज्ञानं नैवं मुख्यं तु दर्शनम्॥'

इत्थं मुख्य साक्षात्कारस्याहेतुत्वे तत्रापेक्षैव न स्यादित्युक्तम्। न हि स्वपरिगृहीतोपाय-विशेष निर्वर्तनव्यग्रः प्राज्ञः कुतूहलमात्रेणान्यत् किञ्चिदाद्रियेत। हेतुत्वेतु निदि-ध्यासितव्य इति श्रुतं ध्यानतैरपेक्ष्यं बाध्येतेत्यपि विभाव्यम्। श्रीसारास्वादिन्यामपि — 'भक्तियोग एव उपाय इति चेत् परभक्तिपरज्ञानपरमभक्तय उपाया इत्यातिष्ठमान-सम्प्रदायविरोधः किं न स्यात्। भक्तियोग एव परभक्तिरित्यप्यभिधीयत इति चेत्' इति, 'अस्य आप्रयाणमनुवर्तमानत्वेऽपि मध्ये परज्ञानाभिधानं ज्ञानविशेषं परमभक्ति-नामकं भक्तिविशेषं चोत्पाद्य तन्मुखेन मोक्षमप्युत्पादयति। अतो न कश्चिद्विरोध इति चेत्' इति, 'तथा च साक्षात्काररूपपरज्ञानस्य परमभक्तिजननमुखेन हेतुत्वमिति भावः' इति च परभक्तिपरज्ञानपरमभक्तीनां तिसृणामपि हेतुत्वमङ्गीकृतमेव। परज्ञानत्वेनाभि-हितोऽयं साक्षात्कारः द्रष्टव्य इति विहितो गौणसाक्षात्कार एवेति तु नोक्तम्। तन्मूला केवलं केषाञ्चिद् विप्रतिपत्तिः।

प्रसंगादन्यत् किञ्चिदुच्यते। तदधिगमसूत्रभाष्ये श्रुतप्रकाशिका एवं दृश्यते—

'ब्रह्मविद्याप्राप्तिः साक्षात्कारावस्थोपासनलब्धिर्विवक्षिता। 'तस्मिन् दृष्टे क्षीयन्ते' इति हि विषयवाक्यम्। प्राप्तिः उपक्रमः। विद्या-प्राप्तिशब्दः साधारण्यात् प्रपदननिष्पत्तेरपि द्योतकः।'

इति। अश्लेषविनाशौ भक्तिविषये साक्षात्कारावस्थोपक्रमे भवतः। प्रपदनविषये तु तन्निष्पत्त्यनन्तरं भवत इति व्यासार्याणामभिप्रायोऽत्र गम्यते। अत्र श्रीदेशिकचरणानां श्रीसूक्तय एवं दृश्यन्ते —

> 'अस्य विषये निरुपाधिकसर्वशेषी निरुपाधिकस्वतन्त्रः सत्यसंकल्पश्च सर्वेश्वरः सर्वभयकारणं निग्रहसंकल्पं 'तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात्' इत्युक्तरीत्या सद्वारकप्रपत्तिनिष्ठस्य उपासनप्रारम्भ इव प्रपत्तिवाक्योच्चारणप्रथमक्षणे निवर्त्य—'

इति श्रीमद्रहस्यत्रयसारे निर्णयाधिकारे।

> 'प्रारब्धेतराणि प्राप्तिविरोधीनि पूर्वपुण्यपापानि उपायारम्भे निश्शेषं निवर्तेरन्।'

इति तत्रैव चरमश्लोकाधिकारे मोक्षयिष्यामिविवरणे।

> 'इत्थं यथाधिकारं सर्वकर्मप्रायश्चित्ततया विहितयोः भक्तिप्रपत्त्योरन्यतरमार्गेऽवतीर्णस्य तदानीमेव उत्तरपूर्वाघाश्लेषविनाशौ भवतः।'

इति परमपदसोपाने प्रसादनपर्वणि।

> 'इतरेषां तु विद्याधिगमदशायामेवाश्लेषविनाशौ।'

इति न्यायसिद्धाञ्जने जीवपरिच्छेदे।

> 'उपायाधिगमकाले........'

इति उपकारसंग्रहे च सूत्रस्थाधिगमशब्दमात्रप्रयोगेऽपि अन्यत्र आरम्भशब्दप्रयोगात् भक्तियोगस्य प्रपदनस्य वा उपक्रमक्षण एवाश्लेषविनाशौ भवत इति श्रीदेशिकचरणानां अभिसन्धिः प्रतीयते। अयमत्र एषां भावो भवितुमर्हति। 'तस्मिन् दृष्टे' इति ग्रन्थिमोक्षादिसाधनतया दर्शनं विधीयते — दर्शनेन ग्रथिमोक्षादिफलं भावयेदिति। अप्राप्तत्वात् विधेयान्तराभावाच्च। एवं यत् कर्माणि क्षीयन्ते तत् तस्मिन् दृष्टे सति इति कर्मक्षयकालबोधकत्वमस्य वाक्यस्य न भवति। द्रष्टव्य इत्यस्यैव। न च कालबोधकत्वमेवास्यास्तु, न विधायकत्वमिति वाच्यम्। उपायानुवादकत्वे लिङ्गाभावात्। वेदान्तरवाक्यतया स्वतन्त्रविधित्वसम्भवाच्च। एवं चास्य कालविशेषबोधकत्वाभावे

एवमेवं विद्धि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यते, एवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मान: प्रदूयन्त इत्यादिषु विलम्बे हेत्वभावात् आरम्भक्षण एव अश्लेषविनाशौ भवत इति युक्तमवधारणम्। ये तु एवमवधारणमकुर्वन्त: श्रुतौ अश्लेषविनाशौ दीर्घकालानुवृत्ते उपासने कदा भवत इत्यस्ति कालाकाङ्क्षा इति मन्यन्ते तेषां तत्प्रशमनं 'तस्मिन् दृष्टे क्षीयन्ते' इति यथाश्रुत-वाक्य विन्यासानुरोधेन क्रियमाणं न दुष्यतीति व्यासार्याणमभिप्राय इति ॥

SRI N.S. RAMANUJA TATACHARYA

कारणत्रयविभागविमर्शः

तर्कसंग्रह-दीपिका-कारिकावली-मुक्तावलीप्रभृतिषु न्यायवैशेषिकानुसारिषु ग्रन्थेषु समवायिकारणं असमवायिकारणं निमित्तकारणं चेति कारणं त्रेधा विभज्य तस्य प्रत्येकं लक्षणमपि परिष्कृत्य प्रतिपादितमस्तीत्ययं विषयः मन्ये प्रायः सर्वेषां संस्कृतविदुषां विदितचर इति। अत्र केचन पाश्चात्यविद्वांसः पाश्चात्यरीत्या विमर्शकाश्च विद्वांसः एवं कारणस्य त्रेधा विभागः न सूत्रादिषु प्राचीनेषु ग्रन्थेषु उल्लिखितः, केवलं नव्यनैयायिकैः सविजृम्भणं प्रतिपादितः इत्यलिखन् इत्यशृणवम्। एतत्तत्त्वं प्रतिबोधयितुमयं लेखः।

वैशेषिकसूत्रेष्वेव कारणत्रयप्रस्तावो विद्यते इति आदौ निरूपयामः। दशमेऽध्याये द्वितीयाह्निके आदिमानि सप्त सूत्राणि विमृशेम। तत्र प्रथमं सूत्रम् –

'कारणमिति द्रव्ये कार्यसमवायात्'

इति। इदं च सूत्रं उपस्कारे इत्थं व्याख्यातम् –

'कारणं – समवायिकारणमिदमिति
प्रतीतिप्रयोगौ द्रव्ये द्रष्टव्यौ। कुत एवम्?
अत आह – कार्यसमवायात्। कार्याणि
द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि तत्रैव समवयन्ति यतः।'

इति। पटादिरूपं द्रव्यं तन्त्वादिद्रव्ये समवायसंबन्धेन वर्तते। शुक्लादिगुणः पटादिद्रव्ये समवायेन वर्तते। उत्क्षेपणादिरूपा क्रिया हस्तादिद्रव्ये समवायसंबन्धेनास्ति।

एवं च कार्याणां द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समवायसंबन्धेन द्रव्ये वर्तमानत्वात् द्रव्यं समवायिकारणमिति सूत्रार्थः। यद्यपि सूत्रे कारणमिति सामान्यत उक्तम्; तथापि कार्यसमवायात् इति हेतुमहिम्ना कारणपदेन समवायिकारणमेव विवक्षितमिति निर्श्चीयते। न हि समवायिकारणादन्यस्मिन् कारणे कार्यसमवायोऽस्ति। तथा चानेन सूत्रेण समवायिकारणं कणादस्य संमतमित्युन्नीयते। अस्य सूत्रस्य न कोऽप्यन्योऽर्थः संभवति। कारणपदं हि यदि कारणसामान्यपरं स्यात् तदा द्रव्यं, कारणमिति प्रतीतिव्यवहारयोर्विषयः, कार्यसमवायात् इत्यर्थः सूत्रस्य वक्तव्यः स्यात्। स चासंगतः। कार्यसमवायरहितेषु गुणक्रियादिष्वपि तन्तुरूपं पटरूपस्य कारणमित्यादिप्रतीतेर्व्यवहारस्य च सत्त्वेन कार्यसमवायस्य कारणमिति प्रतीतिव्यवहाराप्रयोजकत्वात्। अतः समवायिकारणपरत्वमेव सूत्रस्थकारणपदस्य योयुज्यते। अनेन च सूत्रेण कार्यसमवायाश्रयत्वं समवायेन कार्याश्रयत्वं वा समवायिकारणत्वमिति लक्षणमपि सूचितम्।

ततो द्वितीयं सूत्रं – 'संयोगाद्वा' इति। न केवलं समवायिकारणत्वमेव द्रव्यस्य, अपि तु निमित्तकारणत्वमपीत्यनेन सूत्रेण प्रतिपाद्यते। पूर्वसूत्रादत्र 'कारणमिति द्रव्ये' इत्यनुवर्तते। अनुवृत्तस्य च कारणशब्दस्य पूर्वसूत्रे समवायिकारणपरस्यापि अत्र सूत्रे निमित्तकारणपरत्वमौचित्यादाश्रीयते। तथा च द्रव्ये निमित्तकारणमिति प्रतीतिव्यवहारौ संयोगात् हेतोर्भवतः इति सूत्रार्थः। 'तुरीतन्तुसंयोगस्यापि पटकारणत्वात् तद्वशा तुर्यास्तन्तोश्च पटनिमित्तकारणत्वमपि' इति उपस्कारग्रन्थोऽत्रानुसन्धेयः। अस्यापि सूत्रस्य समञ्जसमर्थान्तरं न पश्यामः।

यद्वा वाशब्दः समुच्चयार्थकः। पूर्वसूत्रादनुवृत्तस्य कारणपदस्यात्र सूत्रेऽपि समवायिकारणमित्येवार्थः। द्रव्यस्य तन्त्वादेः पटादिकं प्रति यत्समवायिकारणत्वं वर्तते तत् तुरीतन्तुसंयोगाच्च भवति। तुरीतन्तुसंयोगो नास्ति चेत् संयुज्यमानेष्वपि तन्तुषु पटो नोत्पद्येत। तन्तोः पटसमवायिकारणत्वं च न स्यात्। तथा च समवायिकारणासमवायिकारणानुग्राहकत्वरूपं निमित्तकारणलक्षणमपि अत्र सूत्रे सूचितमिति मन्तव्यम्।

ततस्तृतीयं सूत्रं 'कारणे समवायात् कर्माणि' इति अनेन सूत्रेण कर्मणां कारणत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते। कर्माणि कारणानि। कस्मात्? कारणे समवायात्। कस्य कारणे इत्याकाङ्क्षायां कार्यस्येति अर्थात् सिध्यति। तथा च या क्रिया यत्कार्यस्य कारणं भवति, सा तत्कार्यकारणे समवेता सती तत्कार्यकारणं भवतीतिर्थः। यथा सूत्रा

हस्तगतक्रियया हस्तपुस्तकसंयोगो जायते । तत्र कार्यं संयोगः तस्य कारणं (समवायिकारणं) हस्तः तत्र समवेता सती क्रिया संयोगकारणं भवति । तथा च कार्यसमवायिकारणे समवेतं सत् यत् कारणं तत् प्रथमसूत्रोक्तसमवायिकारणविलक्षणत्वात् । असमवायिकारणमिति व्यपदिश्यते । अनेन च सूत्रेण कार्यैकार्थप्रत्यासत्त्या कारणत्वरूपं असमवायिकारणत्वं सूचितम् ।

अत्र सूत्रे 'कर्मणि' इति सप्तम्येकवचनान्तपाठः साधीयान् । प्रथमसूत्रे 'द्रव्ये' इति पाठात्, तथा उपरि सूत्रे 'रूपे' इति पाठाच्च । तथा चात्र प्रथमसूत्रात् 'कारणमिति' इति भागः अनुवर्तते । कर्मणि — क्रियायां कारणमिति प्रतीतिव्यवहारौ कारणे समवायात् भवतः इति सूत्रार्थः ।

ततश्चतुर्थं सूत्रम् —

'तथा रूपे कारणैकार्थसमवायाच्च'

इति । अत्रापि प्रथमसूत्रात् 'कारणमिति' इत्यनुवर्तते । तथा शब्देन वा स भागो विवक्षितः । रूपे कारणमिति प्रतीतिव्यवहारौ कारणैकार्थसमवायात् भवतः इति सूत्रार्थः । तन्तुगतं रूपं हि कार्यभूतस्य पटरूपस्य यत् कारणं पटः तेन सह एकस्मिन्नर्थे तन्तौ समवेतम् । तथा च कारणैकार्थप्रत्यासत्त्या कारणत्वरूपसमवायिकारणत्वमत्र सूत्रे सूचितम् ।

ततः सप्तमं सूत्रं — 'संयुक्तसमवायादग्नेर्वैशेषिकम्' इति । अत्र कारणमिति पदमध्याहार्यम् । अग्नेः वैशेषिकं — विशेषगुणरूपमौष्ण्यं पाकजरूपादिषु कारणम्, रूपाद्याश्रयवस्तुसंयुक्ते अग्नौ समवायात् । इदं च कारणं पूर्वोक्तकारणद्वयविलक्षणत्वात् निमित्तकारणमिति व्यपदिश्यते ।

इत्थं च एतैः सूत्रैः, नव्यनैयायिकैः यत् कारणत्रयस्य लक्षणमुक्तम्, तत् स्ववाचा उक्त्वा कारणत्वं प्रतिपादितमिति कारणत्रयमपि सूचितमित्येव निर्णीयते । यद्यपि सूत्राण्येतानि, द्रव्यस्य कारणत्वे कार्यसमवायो हेतुः, कर्मणः कारणत्वे कार्यैकार्थसमवायः प्रयोजकः, रूपस्य कारणत्वे कारणैकार्थसमवायः प्रयोजकः, औष्ण्यस्य कारणत्वे कारणसंयुक्तसमवायः प्रयोजकः इत्येतावन्मात्रकथनेन तस्य तस्य कारणत्वप्रकारमेव स्पष्टीकुर्वन्तीति प्रतीयते, तथापि प्रयोजकवैलक्षण्यात् कारणत्वेऽपि वैलक्षण्यमाश्रित्य

कारणत्वस्य समवायिकारणत्वासमवायिकारणत्वनिमित्तकारणत्वरूपेण त्रैविध्यमनन्तरकालिकाः आशिश्रियिरे इति युक्तं मन्यामहे ।

तथापि सूत्रकारेण समवायिकारणं असमवायिकारणं निमित्तकारणमिति शब्दाप्रयोगात् एतैः शब्दैर्विभागः सूत्रानारूढ इति चेत् — अत्र ब्रूमः । अध्यायान्तरे ते शब्दाः प्रयुक्ताः सन्ति । दशमाध्याये लक्षणकथनमिति विवेक इति । तथा हि — प्रथमाध्यायप्रथमाह्निके पञ्चदशं सूत्रम् —

'क्रियागुणवत् समवायिकारणमिति द्रव्यलक्षणम्' इति । अत्र स्पष्टमेव समवायिकारणं सूत्रकृता निर्दिष्टम् । तथा पञ्चमाध्यायद्वितीयाह्निके चतुर्विंशं सूत्रम् —

'कारणं त्वसमवायिनो गुणाः'

इति । अनेन हि गुणानामसमवायिकारणत्वं वदता सूत्रकारेण असमवायिकारणमपि कण्ठरवेण निर्दिष्टम् । तथा तत्रैव षड्विंशं सूत्रम् — 'कारणेन कालः' इति । अत्र च कालस्य निमित्तकारणत्वमुक्तम् ।

अथ प्रशस्तपादभाष्येऽपि कारणत्रयं प्रतिपादितमस्तीति निरूपयामः । गुणग्रन्थे—

' रूपरसगन्धानुष्णस्पर्शसंख्यापरिमाणैकपृथक्त्वस्नेहशब्दानामसमवायिकारणत्वम् । बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नधर्माधर्मभावनानां निमित्तकारणत्वम् ।'

इति भाष्यम्। अत्र कारणद्वयं स्पष्टमेव निरदेशि। अत्र च न्यायकन्दल्यां श्रीधराचार्यः—

समवायिकारणप्रत्यासन्नमवधृतसामर्थ्यमसमवायिकारणम् । प्रत्यासत्तिश्च समवायिकारणसमवायः समवायिकारणैकार्थसमवायाश्च'

इति । लक्षणमपि प्रत्यपीपदत् । तथा परत्वापरत्वनिरूपणप्रकरणे प्रशस्तपादभाष्ये कारणत्रयमपि स्पष्टं निर्दिष्टम् । तथा हि तत्र भाष्यम् —

'एकस्यां दिश्यवस्थितयोः पिण्डयोः संयुक्तसमवायबह्वल्पभावे सत्येकस्य द्रष्टुः संनिकृष्टमवधिं कृत्वा एतस्माद्विप्रकृष्टोऽयमिति परत्वाधारेऽसंनिकृष्टा बुद्धिरुत्पद्यते । ततस्तामपेक्ष्य परेण दिक्प्रदेशेन संयोगात् परत्वस्योत्पत्तिः ।'

इति । अत्र च न्यायकन्दली –

'तां विप्रकृष्टां बुद्धिं निमित्तकारणीकृत्य दिक्प्रदेशेन संयोगादसमवायिकारणात् विप्रकृष्टे पिण्डे समवायिकारणभूते परत्वस्योत्पत्तिः'

इति प्रशस्तपादभाष्यं व्यवृणोत् । अनेन च संदर्भेण परत्वोत्पत्तिं प्रति परत्वाश्रयवस्तु समवायिकारणम्, दिग्वस्तुनोः संयोगः असमवायिकारणम्, अयमस्माद्विप्रकृष्ट इति बुद्धिर्निमित्तकारणमिति ज्ञायते । यद्यप्यत्र भाष्ये एतेषां त्रयाणां बुद्धिसंयोगद्रव्याणां समवाय्यसमवायिनिमित्तकारणपदैर्न व्यपदेशः कृतोऽस्ति, केवलं न्यायकन्दल्यामेव तथास्ति व्यपदेश इति आपाततो भायात्; तथापि परत्वापरत्वयोः अपेक्षाबुद्धि-संयोग-द्रव्याणां त्रयाणां युगपन्नाशादपि नाशो भवतीति प्रतिपादनसंदर्भे –

'विनाशस्त्वपेक्षाबुद्धिसंयोगद्रव्यविनाशात् । ....युगपत् त्रयाणां समवाय्यसमवायिनिमित्तकारणानां विनाशात् परत्वस्य विनाशः ।'

इति प्रशस्तपादभाष्ये स्पष्टं कारणत्रयमपि निर्दिष्टमिति सुधियो विभावयन्तु । किमितोऽपि स्पष्टवचनमपेक्ष्यते ।

तथा किरणावल्यामुदयनाचार्यः कारणत्रयमपि कण्ठरवेण निरदिक्षत् । 'द्रव्याश्रितत्वं च द्रव्यसमवायिकारणकता' (p. 147, Calcutta edition) इति ग्रन्थेन प्रशस्तपादभाष्यस्थद्रव्याश्रितत्वपदव्याख्यानपरेण द्रव्यं गुणादीनां समवायिकारणमिति प्रतिपादयाम्बभूव । 'असमवायिकारणत्वं गुणकर्मणोरेव' (p. 155) इति ग्रन्थेन गुणकर्मणोरसमवायिकारणत्वं प्रतिपादयता असमवायिकारणमनुमेने । 'दिशिकाले च सर्वोत्पत्तिमतां निमित्तकारणत्वम्' (p. 177) इति ग्रन्थेन दिशः कालस्य च सर्वकार्यनिमित्तकारणत्वं वदन् निमित्तकारणमप्यङ्गीचक्रे । एवं च करणत्रयविभागः उदयनाचार्यस्यापि संमतः इति सिद्धम् ।

एतावता वैशेषिकदर्शने प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु कारणत्रयविभागः संमत इति न्यरूरुपाम । अथ न्यायदर्शनेऽपि तत्र संमतिरस्तीति प्रतिपादयामः । यद्यपि न्यायसूत्रेषु कारणत्रयप्रस्तावो न दृश्यते, तथापि वात्स्यायनभाष्ये तत्सूचनं वर्तते । तथा हि न्यायदर्शने चतुर्थाध्याये प्रथमाह्निके अष्टादशं सूत्रम् –

'क्रमनिर्देशादप्रतिषेधः'

इति । इदं च सूत्रं शून्यमेव जगदुपादानकारणमिति मतनिराकरणसंदर्भे विद्यते । अत्र च भाष्यम् –

> 'बीजावयवा: कुतश्चिन्निमित्तात् प्रादुर्भूतक्रिया: पूर्वव्यूहं जहति व्यूहान्तरं चापद्यन्ते । व्यूहान्तरात् अङ्कुर उत्पद्यते । दृश्यन्ते खलु अवयवास्तत्संयोगाश्चाङ्कुरोत्पत्तिहेतव: ।'

इति । अत्र च कुतश्चिन्निमित्तादित्यनेन अदृष्टादिरूपं निमित्तकारणं सूचितम् । 'अवयवास्तत्संयोगाश्चाङ्कुरोत्पत्तिहेतव:' इत्यनेन अवयवरूपं समवायिकारणं, अवयव-संयोगरूपं असमवायिकारणं च सूचितम् ।

तथा न्यायवार्तिके उद्योतकर: 'तत्कारितत्वादहेतु:' (न्या. सू. 4–1–21) इति सूत्रव्याख्यानावसरे –

> 'तत्कारितत्वापित्येवं ब्रुवता निमित्तकारणमीश्वर: इत्युपगतं भवति । यच्च निमित्तं तदितरयो: समवायिकारणासमवायि-कारणयोरनुग्राहकम्, यथा तुर्यादि तन्तूनां तत्संयोगानां च'

इति सुस्पष्टं कारणत्रयं निरदिशत् । अत्र हि निमित्तकारणस्य समवायिकारणासमवायि-कारणानुग्राहकत्वरूपं लक्षणमपि समसूसुचत् । 'यथा तुर्यादि तन्तूनां तत्संयोगानां च' इत्यनेन पटं प्रति तुर्यादिकं निमित्तकारणं तन्तव: समवायिकारणं तन्तूनां संयोग: असमवायिकारणमिति च अभ्यधात् । तथा उत्तरत्र –

> 'ईश्वरश्चेज्जगतो निमित्तकारणं, जगत: साक्षादुपादानकारणं किम् ? उक्तं पृथिव्यादि परमसूक्ष्मं परमाणुसंज्ञितं द्रव्यमिति'

इति ग्रन्थेन ईश्वर: जगत् प्रति निमित्तकारणम्, परमाणव: समवायिकारणमिति अचकथत् । तथा स एव न्यायवार्तिककार: –

'घ्राणरसनचक्षुस्त्वक्श्रोत्राणीन्द्रियाणि भूतेभ्य:' (न्या. सू. 1–1–12) इति सूत्रव्याख्यानसंदर्भे –

> 'न किंचिदप्येककारणकं कार्यं दृष्टम् । सर्वं हि कार्यं प्रादुर्भवत् समवाय्यसमवायिनिमित्तकारणेभ्यो भवतीति'

इति ग्रन्थेन सर्वस्यापि कार्यस्योत्पत्तौ त्रीणि कारणान्यपेक्षितानीति स्पष्टं प्रतिपादयाम्बभूव । तथा च न्यायदर्शनान्तर्गतेषु प्राचीनग्रन्थेष्वपि समवायिकारणासमवायिकारण-

निमित्तकारणरूपेण कारणं त्रिविधमिति विषयः प्रतिपादितोऽस्तीति सिद्धम्। नव्यग्रन्थेषु तेषां लक्षणान्येव परिष्कृत्य प्रदर्शितानीति विद्वांसो विदांकुर्वन्तु।

अत्र काचिदाशङ्का अवतरति – यथा वेदान्तिप्रभृतयः उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं चेति कारणं द्विविधमित्यातिष्ठन्ते तथा किमिति नैयायिका नाङ्गीकुर्वन्ति इति। तत्र ब्रूमः। नैयायिका अवयवातिरिक्तमवयविनं स्वीकुर्वन्ति। वेदान्तिनस्तु तन्तूनां संयोगविशेष एव पटः न तदतिरिक्त इति प्राहुः। वेदान्तिनां मते संयोगः कार्यकोटौ निविशते। नैयायिकानां मते तु पटनामकः अवयवी कार्यभूतः। स च तन्तुसंयोगविशेषादुत्पद्यते। अतस्तन्तुसंयोगोऽपि कारणमिति स्वीकर्तव्यम्। तस्य च समवायिकारणत्वासंभवेन असमवायिकारणत्वं प्रतिपादितम् इति। तदेतत् श्रीमद्वेदान्तदेशिकश्रीचरणाः न्यायसिद्धाञ्जने – (p. 233, P.B.A. ed.)

> 'असमवायीत्यवान्तरविभागस्तु नास्मदीयैरभ्युपगतः; पारिभाषिकत्वात्। पटाद्यसमवायितया तन्तुसंयोगादयस्तु असिद्धा एव; अवयविभङ्गात्'

इति संदर्भेण स्पष्टीचक्रुः।

तर्हि समवायिकारणं निमित्तकारणं चेति द्वेधा विभागोऽस्तु। तन्तुसंयोगस्यापि निमित्तकारणत्वमेवास्तु इति चेत्। अत्रोच्यते। निमित्तकारणभूततन्तुवायनाशेऽपि पटरूपं कार्यं तिष्ठति। तन्तुसंयोगनाशे तु न पटस्तिष्ठति अपि तु नश्यति। अतः प्रसिद्धनिमित्तकारणवैधर्म्यात् समवायिकारणवैधर्म्याच्च तन्तुसंयोगः असमवायिकारणत्वेन स्वीकृत इति।

किं च असमवायिकारणानभ्युपगमे द्रव्यनाशं प्रति किं कारणमिति वक्तव्यम्। न तावत् निमित्तकारणनाशः, कुलालादिसद्भावेऽपि घटनाशदर्शनात् कुलालादिनाशेऽपि घटसद्भवदर्शनाच्च। नापि समवायिकारणनाशः प्रयोजकः, द्व्यणुकनाशानुपपत्तेः। द्व्यणुकस्य हि परमाणुः समवायिकारणम्। न हि तस्य नाशः संभवति, तस्य नित्यत्वात्। अतः द्व्यणुकस्य समवायिकारणनाशान्नाशो न संभवतीति असमवायिकारणभूतस्य परमाणुद्वयसंयोगस्य नाशादेव नाशो वक्तव्यः। तथा च द्व्यणुकनाशस्य असमवायिकारणनाशो हेतुः, इतरकार्यद्रव्यनाशस्य समवायिकारणनाशो हेतुरिति कल्पनामपेक्ष्य अनुगत-

तया कार्यद्रव्यसामान्यनाशं प्रति असमवायिकारणनाशः कारणमिति कल्पनमेव ज्यायः । तथा च एतदर्थमपि असमवायिकारणस्वीकारः आवश्यकः ।

तर्हि समवायिकारणं असमवायिकारणं चेति द्वेधा विभागोऽस्तु, निमित्तकारणं मास्तु इति चेत् — श्रूयताम् । यदि समवायिकारणभिन्नं सर्वं कारणं असमवायिकारणमिति वर्गेऽन्तर्भाव्यते तर्हि असमवायिकारणनाशस्य पूर्वोक्तरीत्या द्रव्यनाशहेतुत्वात् कुलालादिनाशेऽपि घटनाशापत्तिः स्यात् । अतः निमित्तकारणमतिरिक्तता स्वीकरणीयमिति ।

तदेतत् सर्वं मनसि निधाय दिनकरीये (p.110, Nirnaya Sagar edition)-

> 'तुरीतन्तुसंयोगस्य निमित्तकारणस्य पटं प्रति कुतो नासमवायिकारणत्वमिति नाशङ्कनीयम् । तुरीतन्तुसंयोगनाशे पटनाशापत्तेः । असमवायिकारणनाशस्य द्रव्यनाशजनकत्वात् । न चासमवायिकारणनाशस्य द्रव्यनाशकत्वे प्रमाणाभाव इति वाच्यम् । द्व्यणुकनाशान्यथानुपपत्तेरेव प्रमाणत्वात् ।'

इति प्रतिपादितम् ।

तस्मात् नैयायिकमतेन कारणत्रमपि स्वीकारणीयमिति, तच्च कारणत्रयं प्राचीनग्रन्थारूढमिति च सिद्धम् ॥

Dr. T. KODANDARAMAIAH

ఇరుగు పొరుగు సాహిత్యప్రక్రియలు

కన్నడము, మలయాళము

1 ధార్మికకావ్యము :

కన్నడమున జైనకవులు రచించిన కావ్యములు ధార్మికము లనియు, లౌకికము లనియు రెండు విధములుగ విభజింపఁదగియున్నవి. వీనిలో ధార్మిక కావ్యములు జైన మతమునకుఁ జెందిన తీర్థంకరులయొక్కయు, మహాపురుషులయొక్కయు జీవితచరిత్రముల నభివర్ణించుచు, తన్మత ప్రచార సాధనములుగ రచింపఁబడినవి లౌకికకావ్యము లట్లుకాక ప్రసిద్ధము లైన రామాయణ మహాభారతాది పురాణములనుండి యితివృత్తములను గ్రహించి తమ్ముఁ బోషించిన రాజులయొక్క చరిత్రములను లేదా కృతిభర్తలయొక్క చరిత్రములను, సమకాలిక జనుల జీవితమును సూచించునట్లుగ రచింపఁబడిన ధ్వనికావ్యములు. ఈ యుభయ పద్ధతులకుఁ జెందిన రచనములు ఇతర భారతీయ భాషలకు సరిక్రొత్త యవి చెప్పఁదగును. ధార్మిక కావ్యములలో అద్భుతశాంతరసములు చక్కఁగా ప్రతిపాదింపఁబడును. అర్థ కామముల తృష్ణతోఁ జేసిన కర్మములకు ఫలముగ తిర్యక్, మనుష్య, నారక, దేవ — అను నాలుగు గతులను పొందు జీవుఁడు జినధర్మము నవలంబించి సమ్యక్ దర్శనము, సమ్యక్ జ్ఞానము, సమ్యక్ చారిత్రము — అను రత్నత్రయముచే పరిష్కృతుఁడై దాన ధర్మ వైరాగ్య తపస్సులచే నుత్తమ జన్మములను క్రమముగా పొందుచుండును. ఈ జన్మముల యవసానమునం దాజీవుఁడు 'అహమింద్రుఁ'డై దేవలోకమున నుండి యందు పరిశుద్ధాత్ముఁడై మనుష్య లోకమునకు వచ్చి చరమదేహధారి యగును. ఇచట నతఁడు వైరాగ్యముచే సకల పాపములను క్షాళనము గావించుకొని, తపస్సు నాచరించి, తత్ఫలముగా కర్మక్షయము సాధించి, తీర్థంకరుఁడై, జైన ధర్మమును లోకమునకు బోధించి నిర్వాణము పొందును. ఏ తీర్థంకరుని జీవిత చరిత్రము నభివర్ణించుకావ్య మైనను నది యిట్టి

యితివృత్తముతోనే కూడియుండును. ప్రతి జైన కావ్యమునందును భవావళి (జన్మపరంపర), పంచకల్యాణములు, వైరాగ్యము, తపస్సు, ముక్తిస్థలము, ఇంద్రపూజ, ఆనంద నృత్యములు — అనునవి విధిగా నభివర్ణింపఁబడును. వీనిలో పంచకల్యాణము లనఁగా స్వర్గావతరణ కల్యాణము, జన్మాభిషేక మహాకల్యాణము, పరినిష్క్రమణ కల్యాణము, సౌధర్మేంద్ర కల్యాణము, పరినిర్వాణ కల్యాణము అనునవి. ఇవి ప్రతి తీర్థంకరునకును అభివర్ణింపఁబడును. కన్నడమున నాదికవి యని ప్రసిద్ధుఁడైన పంపమహాకవి జైనమతమునకుఁ జెందిన యిరువదినాలుగుమంది తీర్థంకరులలో ప్రథమ తీర్థంకరుఁడైన వృషభనాథుని చరిత్రము 'ఆదిపురాణ' మను పేరుతో రచించెను. పంపమహాకవి యీ కథను జినసేనుడు సంస్కృతమునందు రచించిన 'పూర్వపురాణ' మను గ్రంథమునుండి గ్రహించె నని తెలియుచున్నది. రత్నత్రయములో రెండవవాఁ డగు పొన్నకవి 'శాంతిపురాణ' మను ఒక ధార్మిక కావ్యమును రచించెను. ఇందు తీర్థంకరులలో పదునారవవాఁ డగు శాంతినాథుని జీవిత మభివర్ణింపఁబడినది. రన్నకవి కూడ పంపనివలెనే ఒక ధార్మిక కావ్యమును, ఒక లౌకిక కావ్యమును రచించెను. 'అజితపురాణము' అనునది యతఁడు రచించిన ధార్మిక కావ్యము. ఇందు రెండవ తీర్థంకరుఁడైన అజితనాథుని యొక్క చరిత్ర మభివర్ణింపఁబడినది. ఈ ధార్మిక కావ్యములు సాధారణముగా చంపువులుగా రచింప బడుట పరిపాటి. ఇందు వర్ణింపఁదగు మహాపురుషులకు 'శలాకా పురుషులు' అని పేరు. వారు అరువది ముగ్గురు కలరు. అందు తీర్థంకరులు 24 మంది, చక్రవర్తులు 12 గురు, బలదేవులు 9 గురు, వాసుదేవులు 9 గురు, ప్రతివాసుదేవులు 9 గురు. — మొత్తము అరువది ముగ్గురు. వీరి కందఱికి కలిపి 'త్రిషష్టి శలాకా మహాపురుషులు' అని పేరు. వీరిలో నే శలాకాపురుషునిగూర్చి యైనఁ బైఁ జెప్పఁబడిన పద్ధతిలో రచింపఁబడిన కావ్యమునకు 'ధార్మికకావ్యము' అనిపేరు. ధార్మిక కావ్య మనఁగా జినధర్మమునకు సంబంధించిన కావ్యము అని భావము.

2 వచనము :

ఇది బసవయుగమునందు కన్నడమున వ్యాప్తిలోనికి వచ్చిన యొక సాహిత్య రూపము. నిజమునకు ఈ యుగమునందలి విశిష్ట సాహిత్యరూప మగు వచనము బసవేశ్వరునికి పూర్వమే పుట్టి ప్రచారమునకు వచ్చియుండెను. కాని దీనికి విశేషప్రచారము కలిగినది బసవేశ్వరుని కాలమునందే. ఇందలి భాష సరళమై యుండును క్లిష్టమైన సంస్కృత పదాడంబర మిందుఁ గానరాదు. సామాన్య జనులకై వ్రాయఁబడిన మిక్కిలి స్వతంత్రమైన రచన మిది. ఇట్లు వచనముల రూపములో నున్న యీ రచనములను పాటలుగా కూడ పాడుకొన వచ్చును. ప్రతి వచనము తుదిని ఆయా వచనకారులయొక్క యిష్టదైవముల పేర్లు మకుటముగా నిలుపఁబడియుండును. బసవేశ్వరుఁడు రచించిన వచనముల తుదిని 'కూడలి సంగమదేవా' యను మకుట ముండును. అక్కమహాదేవి రచితములైన వచనముల తుదిని

'చెన్న మల్లికార్జునా' యను మకుట ముండును. అల్లమ ప్రభుదేవర రచించిన వచనములలో మకుటము 'గుహేశ్వరా' యనునది. ఇందలి శైలి ఛందోబద్ధము కాదు అట్లని యది గద్యరూప రచన మనుటకును వీలు లేదు. ఇది లయాత్మక మైన శైలితోఁ గూడి సంగీత యుక్తముగఁ బాడుట కనుకూలముగా నుండును. సామాన్య మానవుఁడు తన దైనందిన జీవితమునందు వాడునట్టి పదములే యిం దెక్కువగా నుండును. పునరుద్ధరింపఁబడిన వీర శైవ మత ధర్మములు, ప్రవర్తన నియమావళి, అజ్ఞానము, మూఢవిశ్వాసము — వీని ఖండనము, సంప్రదాయమును, అంధానుకరణమును ఖండనము చేయుట, సర్వమానవ సమానత్వము, కాయకష్టమునకుఁ గల గౌరవస్థితి — యిత్యాదు లిం దభివర్ణింపఁబడును. ఇవియు, నిట్టివే యగు మఱి కొన్నిభావములును, నెదుటివారి మనస్సులలో హత్తుకొని పోవునట్లు, ధారాళ మైన శైలిలో, సామాన్య జీవితమునుండి గ్రహించిన యుపమానాదుల సహాయముతో వీనియం దభివర్ణింపఁబడినవి.

'The tenets of the revived Veera Saiva religion, rules of conduct, criticism of ignorance and superstition and blind worship of tradition, dignity of labour and equality of Man – and many such ideas are expressed in pithy, homely, eloquent and illustrative language. The style is not metrical, nor is it prose as we understand it generally.'

— *Adya Rangacharya.*

'In form, the Vachanas are brief disconnected paragraphs each ending with one or another of the numerous local names under which Siva is worshipped. In style, they are epigrammatical, parallelistic and allusive. They dwell on the vanity of riches, the valuelessness of mere rites or book-learning, the uncertainty of life and the spiritual privileges of the Siva Bhakta.'

— *E. P. Rice.*

తెలుగున కూడ ఇట్టి వచనములు వెలువడినవి. కృష్ణమాచార్యులు రచించిన 'సింహగిరి నరహరి వచనములు' లేక 'కృష్ణమాచార్య వచనములు', తాళ్ళపాక పెదతిరుమలాచార్యుని 'వేంకటేశ్వర వచనమాలికా గీతములు' లేక 'వేంకటేశ్వర వచనములు' ఇట్టివి. ఇవికాక యముద్రితస్థితిలో నున్న భవానీశంకర వచనములు మున్నగునవి కన్నడ సాహిత్యములోని యీ ప్రక్రియను పోలియున్నవి.

3 సాంగత్యము :

ఇది కన్నడమున 17, 18 శతాబ్దములయందు వ్యాప్తిలో నుండిన యొక సాహిత్యప్రక్రియ. సాంగత్య మనునది యొక ఛందోభేదము. ఇది మాత్రాఛందస్సునకు

చెందినది. కన్నడమునందు రగడ, షట్పది, త్రిపది, సాంగత్యము — అను దేశిఛందస్సులు విశేషముగ ప్రాధాన్యము వహించినవి. ఆయా ఛందోభేదముల పేరుమీఁదుగానే యాయా గ్రంథములు కన్నడ సాహిత్యమున వ్యవహరింపఁబడినవి. అట్లే సాంగత్య మనఁబడు ఛందోభేదములో రచింపఁబడినట్టి కావ్యమునకు 'సాంగత్య కావ్యము' అనిపేరు. ఇందు నాలుగుపాదము లుండును. మొదటి, మూఁడవ పాదములలో నాలుగేసి విష్ణుగణములును, రెండు, నాలుగుపాదములలో రెండేసి విష్ణుగణములును, చివర నొక బ్రహ్మగణము నుండును. ఈ ఛందస్సు మొట్టమొదటిసారిగా కన్నడములోని శిశుమాయణుని కావ్యములో కానవచ్చును. సాధారణముగా స్త్రీలపాట లన్నియు నీవృత్తములోనే రచింపఁబడినవి. 17 వ శతాబ్ది మధ్యకాలమున గోవిందవైద్యుఁ డనుకవి మైసూరుపాలకుఁ డగు కంఠీరవ నరసరాజు విజయము నభివర్ణించుచు 'కంఠీరవ నరసరాజవిజయ' మను పేరుతో నొక సాంగత్య గ్రంథమును రచించెను ఇందు మైసూరురాజ వంశమునకు చెందిన కంఠీరవ నరసరాజుయొక్క వీరకార్యములు, కర్ణాటకముపై దండెత్తి వచ్చిన రణదుల్లాఖానుని యత్యాచారములు కన్నులకు గట్టునట్లుగ నభివర్ణింపఁబడినవి. తరువాత మైసూరును పాలించిన చిక్కదేవరాయల యాస్థానములో నతనికి సచివుఁడుగను, విద్వత్కవిశ్రేష్ఠుఁడుగను విరాజిల్లిన కవీశ్వరుఁడు చిక్కుపాధ్యాయుఁడు. ఇతని అసలుపేరు లక్ష్మీపతి. చిక్కదేవరాయలకు రాజగురు వగుటచే నితఁడు చిక్కుపాధ్యాయుఁ డని వ్యవహరింపఁబడెను ఇతఁడు రచించినన్ని గ్రంథములు కన్నడమున మఱి యే కవీశ్వరుఁడును రచించి యుండ లేదు. ముప్పదికి పైగా నతఁడు రచించిన గ్రంథములలో శృంగార శతకము, రంగధామస్తుతి మొదలగు సాంగత్య గ్రంథములు కూడఁ గలవు. ఇతఁడు రచించిన చంపూ కావ్యములు సంస్కృత బహుళము లై ప్రౌఢము లై యున్నను నితని సాంగత్యగ్రంథములు మాత్రము సరళకన్నడములో రచింపఁబడినవి.

మైసూరు రాజ్యమును నేర్పుతో నడపిన మంత్రిసత్తముఁడు తిరుమలార్యుఁడు. ఇతఁడు కూడ చిక్కదేవరాయల యాస్థానమునం దుండి యతనిపై ననేక గ్రంథములను రచించెను. అతని తమ్ముఁడు సింగనార్యుఁడు. హొన్నమ్మ యను కవయిత్రి సింగనార్యుని శిష్యురాలు. ఈమె చిక్కదేవరాయల యాస్థానములో పరిచారికగా నుండెను. అడపకత్తె యైన యీమె తెలివితేటలను గ్రహించి చిక్కదేవరాయ లీమెను సింగనార్యుని కడ విద్యాభ్యాసముఁ జేయించెను. ఆమె వైదుష్యము గడించినపిదప నామహారాజా మెను స్త్రీ ధర్మములను దెలుపు నొక గ్రంథమును రచింపు మని యాజ్ఞాపించెను. ఆ మహారాజుగారి యాజ్ఞ మేరకు హొన్నమ్మ సాంగత్యచ్ఛందములో 'హదిబదెయ ధర్మ' యను గ్రంథమును రచించెను. భారతము, రామాయణము, మనుస్మృతి మొదలగు గ్రంథములనుండి విషయములను గ్రహించి యీమె యీ దేశిఛందమున పతివ్రతాధర్మములను ఈ గ్రంథమునందు వివరించెను.

చిక్కదేవరాయల కుమారుఁ డగు కంఠీరవ నరసరాజు క్రీ శ. 1704 నుండి 1713 వఱకు మైసూరును పాలించెను. ఇతనికి 'మూకరసు' అని నామాంతరము. ఇతఁడు తెలుగు, తమిళము, కన్నడము, ప్రాకృతము — లలో పెక్కు గ్రంథములను రచించెను. ఇతఁడు తెలుఁగున రచించిన యక్షగానములలో సాంగత్యచ్ఛందోపద్ధతి యటనట కాన వచ్చును. ఇతని 'ఆంధ్ర కౌరవంజి' యను గ్రంథమున సాంగత్యచ్ఛందమునందు రచింపఁ బడిన పద్యములు కలవు.

సాత్యవతి నే నుందు స్వర్గాన నే నుందు
నిత్యమ్ము ధరలోన నుందు
అత్యంతాద్భుత మైన యమరాదియం దుందు
సత్యమ్ము సర్వత్ర యుందు' —

కన్నడములోని యీ సాహిత్యప్రక్రియ దక్షిణాంధ్ర యుగమున తెలుగున కూడ ననుసరింపఁబడినది. తంజావూరు నేలిన మహారాష్ట్ర రాజులకాలమున తెలుగునందు కూడ సాంగత్యకావ్యములు వెలయుట కన్నడములోని యీ ప్రక్రియా ప్రభావముచేతనే యని యూహింపఁదగును.

4. కిళిపాట్టు :

కిళిపాట్టు అను సాహిత్యప్రక్రియ మలయాళమున క్రీ.శ. 16, 17 శతాబ్దుల నడిమికాలములో వ్యాప్తిలోనికి వచ్చెను. 'కిళిపాట్టు' అనగా చిలుకపాట యని యర్థము. దీనికి మళయాళ సాహిత్యమున నొక విశిష్ట మగు స్థానము కలదు. ఇందు సాధారణముగా నాధ్యాత్మిక విషయములు అభివర్ణింపఁబడును. కాలక్రమమున నాధ్యాత్మిక విషయములు కానివి కూడ నీ ప్రక్రియకు చెందిన గ్రంథములో చోటు చేసికొనెను. ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ మహాకవి సుకుమార హస్తమున నీ ఛందోవిశేషము అందాలు దిద్దుకొనినదని చెప్పనచ్చును. ఈ ప్రక్రియకు చెందిన కావ్యముయొక్క ప్రారంభమునందు ఒక చిలుక యా కావ్యమును చెప్పుచున్నట్లుగా రచింపఁబడును. కొన్ని కావ్యములలో నీ చిలుకకు బదులుగా హంసగాని తుమ్మెదగాని యుండును. అయినను వానికి 'కిళిపాట్టు' అనియే వ్యవహారము. ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ కిళిపాటును వ్యాప్తిలోనికి గొనివచ్చుట నిజమే యయినను నతనికి పూర్వమే కిళిపాట్టు లన దగినవి కొన్ని వెలసెను. దీని పుట్టుపూర్వోత్తరములను గుఱించి పండితులలో భేదాభిప్రాయ ములు కలవు సరస్వతి చేతిలోని చిలుకయే కిళిపాట్టులోని చిలుక యని కొందఱి యభి ప్రాయము. పౌరాణిక గాథానిధి యగు శుకమహర్షికి చిహ్నముగ దీనియందు చిలుక నిలుపఁబడె నని మఱికొందఱి యభిప్రాయము. భగవంతుఁడు తొలుత ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్‌కు చిలుక

రూపమున ప్రత్యక్షమై ధర్మోపదేశ మొనర్చె ననియు, తరువాతి కాలమున నా యుపదేశము ననుసరించి యతఁడు కృతులు వెలయించె ననియు వేఱొక కొందఱి భావము. ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ శూద్రుఁ డగుటచే తాత్త్విక రహస్యముల నతఁడు చిలుక చెప్పినట్లు పేర్కొనె నని కొంద అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నారు కథ మఱింత రసవత్తరముగ నుండుటకును కథను వినుచున్నప్పు డైనను అందు నమ్మకము కలిగించు నుద్దేశముతోను ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ వంటి కవులు చిలుకను ప్రవేశపెట్టి యుందు రని యాధునిక విమర్శకుల యభిప్రాయము. కిళిపాట్టు నేఁడు కేక, కాకళి, కాకంతి మొదలగు ఛందో విశేషములను కూడ సూచించుచున్నది కేరళ దేశము నకు చెందిన యీ దేశి ఛందోభేదములకు ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ కావ్యగౌరవము కలిగించెను. ఇతని ననుసరించి మలయాళ సాహిత్యమువ పెక్కురు కవులు 'కిళిపాట్టు' ప్రక్రియాభేదమును అవలంబించి రచనలు వెలయించిరి.

5. గాథ :

మలయాళ సాహిత్యమున 'పాట్టు' అనఁబడు జానపదగేయ రచనలు బాగుగా ప్రచారమునకు వచ్చినపిదప సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయమునందలి యితివృత్తములు, అందలి భావములు క్రమముగా కొలది చోటు చేసికొనుటకు ప్రయత్నింపఁజొచ్చెను. తత్ఫలితముగా జానపదకవుల స్థానమును విద్వాంసు లయిన మళయాళ కవులు స్వీకరించి సంస్కృత వాఙ్మయమునందలి యితివృత్తమును మలయాళములో కావ్యరూపమున రచించుటకు నారం భించిరి. ఇతివృత్తము సంస్కృత మూలకమే యయినను కేరళ దేశమునందలి ప్రజలలో మిక్కిలి ప్రచారము పొందిన, ప్రజాదరము చూఱగొనిన దేశిఛందస్సులలో కావ్యరచనము గావించుట వారికి తప్పనిసరి యయ్యెను. దీని మూలమున కొంత విశిష్టమగు సాహిత్యము మలయాళమున క్రీ.శ 15 వ శతాబ్దమునుండి వెలయ నారంభించినది. ఇట్లు ప్రాచీనకాల మున మలయాళమునందు వెలసిన ప్రశస్తకావ్యములలో చెరుశ్శేరి నంబూద్రి రచించిన 'కృష్ణగాథ' యొకటి. దీనికే 'కృష్ణపాట్టు' అని కూడ నామాంతరము కలదు ఈ కావ్య నామమునుబట్టి యిందలి యితివృత్తము కృష్ణునికి సంబంధించిన కథ యని తెలియు చున్నప్పటికిని ఇందలి 'గాథ' యనుమాటకు మలయాళమున నొక విశిష్టార్థము కలదు. కృష్ణగాథ కావ్యము అంతకు మునుపు మలయాళములోని పాట్టులలో స్వీకరింపఁబడిన దేశిఛంద మగు 'మంజరీ' ఛందమున వ్రాయఁబడినది. తరువాతి కాలమున ఈ ఛందస్సు నందు వ్రాయఁబడిన కావ్యమునకే 'గాథ' యను వ్యవహార మేర్పడెను. ఇందుచే కృష్ణగాథ' యనుచో గాథపదమునకు కథ యను సామాన్యార్థమే కాక 'మంజరీఛందస్సునందు రచింపఁబడిన కావ్యము' అను ప్రత్యేకార్థ మొకటి యేర్పడెను. తరువాతి కాలమున మల యాళమునం దెన్నియో గాథా కావ్యములు వెలసినవి. చెరుశ్శేరి నంబూద్రి కృష్ణగాథ యను కావ్యమునే కాక భారతగాథ యను మఱొక కావ్యమును కూడ రచించినట్లు తెలియు

చున్నది. కృష్ణగాథను రచించిన చెరుశ్శేరి సంబూద్రియే భారతగాథను కూడ సంతరించి యుండ నోపు నని బాలకృష్ణనాయర్ మొదలగు పండితులు విశ్వసించిరి కాని మహాకవి ఉళ్లూరు పరమేశ్వర అయ్యరు భారతగాథ యందలి గుణదోషముల నెత్తిచూపి కృష్ణగాథను సంతరించిన కవియే భారతగాథను కూడ రచించెననుట యసంగత మని తెలియఁజేసిరి. కనుక భారతగాథ చెరుశ్శేరిచే కాక మఱొకరెవరి చేతనో రచింప బడిన దని కొందఱు విద్వాంసుల యభిప్రాయము

'The logical ou.come of this infiltration was a change in literary propencities and the replacement of unlettered bards by more learned ones who, while adopting the same musical folk metres could compose on the popular exotic themes. It was a beneficient change, for it enriched Malayalam with an excellent body of noble literature...... Presumably most of the ballads extent now might have been composed after Krishna Gadha. But they marked the culmination of the literary traditions of a much earlier origin'.

— *P.K Parameswaran Nair.*

6. *సందేశకావ్యము :*

మలయాళ సాహిత్యమునందు ఒకానొకకాలమున సందేశ కావ్యరచనము మిక్కిలి వ్యాప్తిలో నుండెను. 'Samdesa kavyas or Messenger Poems have always held a pre-eminent position in the literature of Kerala.' భారతదేశమునందలి యితర భాషాప్రాంతములకంటె నెక్కువగా నీ సందేశ కావ్యరచనము కేరళమున మిక్కిలి వ్యాప్తి నందినది. కేరళవిద్వాంసులు ఒక్క మలయాళమునందు మాత్రమేకాక సంస్కృతము నందుకూడ పెక్కు సందేశకావ్యములను రచించి యుండుట మనము గుర్తింపవలసి యున్నది. క్రీ.శ. 10వ శతాబ్దియందు కేరళమున రచింపఁబడిన శుకసందేశ కావ్యము సంస్కృత సాహిత్యములోనే మేఘసందేశమునకు తరువాత పేర్గాంచదగిన గ్రంథము. ఇదికాక చాతక సందేశము, భ్రమర సందేశము, కోకిల సందేశము మొదలగు కావ్యములు కేరళమున సంస్కృత భాషలో రచితము లయినవి. ప్రణయ భావములను మిక్కిలి చక్కగా ప్రదర్శించుటకు ఈ ప్రక్రియయం దవకాశ ముండుటయే యిది యా ప్రాంతమున బహుళవ్యాప్తి నందుటకు కారణ మని యూహింపఁదగి యున్నది. 'లీలాతిలక' మను లక్షణ గ్రంథమునందు మళయాళమున రచితము లైన పెక్కు సందేశకావ్యములు పేర్కొనఁబడినవి. దీనినిబట్టి 14వ శతాబ్దిలో రచింపఁబడిన 'లీలాతిలకము'నకు పూర్వమే యిట్టి సందేశకావ్యములు మలయాళమున రచితము లగుచుండె నని యూహింపఁదగును. వీనిలో 'ఉణ్ణునీలి సందేశము' అను కావ్యము మిక్కిలి ప్రశస్తమయినది. ఇందులోనుండి యొక పద్యము లీలాతిలకమం దుదాహరింపఁబడుటచే ఇది 14వ శతాబ్దికి పూర్వమే రచింపఁబడిన కావ్య మని చెప్పఁదగును.

ఈ కావ్యమునుబట్టి యా కాలమునాఁటి కేరళదేశపు చారిత్రక సాంఘిక పరిస్థితులను కొంత వఱకు తెలిసికొనవచ్చును. శృంగారరస ప్రధానమయిన యీ కావ్యము నందలి వర్ణనలు స్వతంత్రములు.

'Unnuneeli-samdesam is, by all standards, a first rate Kavya, not only among works of its kind but in all Manipravala Literature. Nothing much is known about its author, nor when he flourished. Judged in the light of internal evidence it is a 14th century composition in which the poet himself is the hero and the heroine a young girl related on the paternal side to the Vadakkumpur Royal family of Central Kerala...... and of extent specimens Unnuneeli-samdesam, the most important one deserves special consideration.' —

— *P.K. Parameswaran Nair.*

మలయాళమునందు ఈ సందేశ కావ్యములకు ప్రజలలో విశేషాదరము లభించు చుండుటచే సందేశ కావ్యములను వెలయించుట ఒకకాలమునందలి కవిపండితులకు పరిపాటి యయిపోయెను. ఈ కారణముచేతనే కాఁబోలు ప్రతికవియు తప్పనిసరిగా నేదో యొక సందేశ కావ్యమును రచించెను. దీనిమూలమున ఈ సందేశ కావ్యముల సంఖ్య విపరీతముగా పెరిగిపోయెను. ఈ పరిస్థితిని చూచి ఒకకవి 'కాక సందేశ' మనుపేరుతో నొక హేళన కావ్యమును కూడ రచించెను. ఇందు ఒకకాకి సందేశమును కొనిపోవునట్లు చెప్పఁబడెను. సంస్కృతములోని కాళిదాస మహాకవి విరచిత మేఘసందేశ కావ్యము ననుసరించి మలయాళమున రచింపఁబడిన యీ సందేశ కావ్యప్రక్రియయందు చంపూ కావ్యములందు వలెనే మణిప్రవాళభాష యవలంబింపఁబడినది. తమిళ సాహిత్యమున వెలసిన 'తూదు' అను సాహిత్య ప్రక్రియ దీనికి సజాతీయమైన ప్రక్రియ యని చెప్పఁదగును.

7. ఆట్టక్కథ :

ఇది మళయాళ సాహిత్యమున క్రీ.శ. 17, 18 శతాబ్దులలో మిక్కిలి వ్యాప్తిలో నుండిన సాహిత్యప్రక్రియ. కేరళము 'కథకళి' నృత్యప్రదర్శనమునకు ప్రసిద్ధి చెందినది. దీనికి నేఁడు విదేశములయందు కూడ విశేషమగు ప్రచారము లభించినది. 'కథకళి' యను మాటలో కథ, కళి యను రెండుమాటలు కలవు. 'కళి' యనఁగా నాటక మని యర్థము. కథకళి యను పదమునకు నాటకవేషము వేసికొనిన కథ యని యర్థము చెప్పుకొనుట సమంజసముగా నుండును. ఈ కథకళి నృత్యప్రదర్శనమునకు ఉపయోగపడు సాహిత్య రూపము ఆట్టక్కథ. ఆట్టక్కథ యనఁగా నాటకమున కుపయోగపడు కథ యని యర్థము. ఆట్టక్కథలో కథకు ప్రాధాన్య ముండగా కథకళిలో ప్రదర్శనమునకు ప్రాధాన్య ముండును. కథకళి యందలి కథ పౌరాణిక మగుటచే ఈ 'ఆట్టక్కథలు' పెక్కు పురాణేతివృత్తములతో రచింపఁబడినవి.

ఏ సాహిత్యచరిత్రమునందు కాని ప్రతిభావంతుడైన యొక మహాకవి వెలసి యస్తమించినపిదప సాధారణముగా నాలోపమును పూర్తిచేయుట యితరులకు దుస్సాధ్యమే యగును. మళయాళసాహిత్యము కూడ నీ సామాన్య సూత్రమున కపవాదము కాదు. క్రీ.శ. 16వ శతాబ్దిలో నుండిన ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ తరువాత వెలసిన మలయాళకవులు అతని వలెనే ప్రసిద్ధులు కాలేక పోయిరి. ఒక శతాబ్దకాలము తరువాత కొట్టారకార తంబురాన్ అనునతడు వాల్మీకి రామాయణము ననుసరించి సాంప్రదాయక శైలిలో నూతనముగ ఒక రామాయణ కావ్యమును రచించెను అందలి కవిత్వము రసవంతమే యయినను ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ రచనముచే ప్రభావితులైన ప్రజలలో దానికి రావలసినంత ప్రశస్తి రాలేదు. 'గిరిజాకల్యాణం హంసపాట్టు' అను కావ్యమును రచించిన ఉణ్ణాయి వారియర్ అను మహాకవి కూడ ఇట్టి ప్రయత్నమే చేసి విఫలుడయ్యెను. ఇందుచే సంప్రదాయ కవిత్వము వ్రాసి ఎళుత్తచ్ఛన్ వలె ప్రజాదరము చూఱగొనుట యితర కవులకు దుస్సాధ్యము కాగా వారు నూతన సాహిత్య మార్గములను చేపట్టి ప్రసిద్ధి వహించుటకు ప్రయత్నింపవలసిన యగత్య మేర్పడెను. అట్టి ప్రయత్న ఫలితముగా నవతరించిన సాహిత్యరూపమే కథకళి కుపయోగపడు 'ఆట్టక్కథ'.

కథకళి యావిర్భావమునుగూర్చి కేరళదేశపు విద్వాంసులలో పెక్కువాదములు కలవు. ఇది యొకానొక ప్రత్యేక వ్యక్తియొక్క సృష్టి కాని, హఠాత్తుగా నాకాశమునుండి యూడిపడిన ప్రక్రియ కాని కాదు. అంతకు మునుపుండిన కళారూపములు పెక్కు మార్పుల నందుచు క్రమ పరిణామము పొంది 17వ శతాబ్దమునాటికి కథకళి రూపమును దాల్చినది కేరళమున అతి ప్రాచీనకాలమునందు 'ముడియేట్టు, తిరయాట్టం, కోలం తుళ్ళల్' అను నాట్యభేదములు వ్యాప్తిలో నుండెను. తరువాతికాలమున 'కూడియాట్టం' అను కళారూపముగా నవి పరిణతి చెందెను. ఈ ప్రాచీన కళారూపముల పరిణామఫలమే కథకళి. దీని యావిర్భావమునకు జయదేవ మహాకవి రచితమగు గీతగోవిందము కూడ కొంతవఱకు కారణభూతమని చెప్పదగును. అందలి కవితా మాధుర్యమునకును, సంగీత శక్తికిని ముగ్ధు లయిన శాక్కియారు లనబడు కేరళదేశపు నట్టువకాండ్రు దానిని రంగస్థలములపై నభినయించి చూపుటకు ప్రయత్నించిరి. ఇట్లు గీతగోవిందములోని యష్టపదులను శాక్కియారులు ప్రదర్శింపగా కేరళదేశపు ప్రజలు వానిని తిలకించి రసానంద పరవశు లగుచుండిరి. తరువాత కళ్ళికోట (Calicut) ప్రభు వగు మానవేదరాజునుతడు గీతగోవింద నాట్యమునకుగల ప్రజాదరమును గుర్తించి 'కృష్ణనాట్టం' అనునొక రచనమును గావించెను. దీనికే 'కృష్ణగీతి' అనికూడ మఱొక పేరు కలదు. ఇందలి పాటలు గీతగోవిందమునందు వలెనే సంస్కృతభాషలో రచింపబడెను. ఇందుచే పాటలయందలి భావములు ప్రేక్షకులలో చాల మందికి అవగతము కానిపరిస్థితి యేర్పడుచుండెను మఱియు నిందు వీరము, రౌద్రము,

అను రసముల నిర్వహణమునకు బొత్తిగా నవకాశము లేకపోయెను. ఇంత మాత్రమే కాక యిందు గాత్ర సంగీతమునకు గాని వాద్యసంగీతమునకు గాని యంతగా ప్రాధాన్యము లేకుండెను. ఈ లోపముల నెల్ల సరిదిద్దుకొని ప్రేక్షకులకు సర్వవిధములుగా నానందము కలిగించు 'ఆట్టక్కథ' కొట్టారకార తంబురాన్ చే రచింపబడెను. దానిపేరు 'రామనాట్టం'. ఇది కృష్ణనాట్టం కంటె సర్వవిధముల మిన్నయై యున్నది. సన్నివేశ ప్రారంభములందున్న అవతారికాపద్యములు సంస్కృతములోఁ గాక మణిప్రవాళశైలిలో రచింపఁబడెను. పాటలు మలయాళభాషలో నున్నవి. నవరసములకును నిందు నిర్వాహము కలదు ధర్మము అధర్మమును జయించునట్లుగా నున్న యితివృత్తము వస్తువుగా స్వీకరింపఁబడెను. ఇదియే తరువాతికాలపు ఆట్టక్కథలకు పరవడి యైనది.

కథకళి స్వరూపము :

కొట్టారకార తంబురాన్ అనునతఁడు ఈ కథకళి ప్రదర్శనమునకు ఒక వ్యవస్థ కల్పించెను. దీనికి సంబంధించిన ఆట్టక్కథ సాహిత్యపరముగా కూడ మంచి విలువగలదై యుండవలెనను సంప్రదాయ మీతనితో ప్రారంభ మయ్యెను. ప్రతి ఆట్టక్కథయు కొన్ని సన్నివేశములక్రింద విభజింపఁబడును. ప్రతి సన్నివేశ ప్రారంభములోను కథాసూత్రమును తెలుపు పద్య మొకటి సంస్కృతములోను, మణిప్రవాళములోను రచింపఁబడి యుండును. నటీనటుల సంభాషణలు మలయాళమున పాటలరూపములో నుండి విద్వాంసులయిన గాయకులచే సశాస్త్రీయముగా పాడఁబడును. ఇందు నటించు నటులు పురుషులే. పురుషులే స్త్రీ పాత్రలనుకూడ ధరింతురు. వారు పాటలలోనువ్న భావములను ముద్రాభినయరూపముతో ప్రదర్శింతురు. దీనికి రంగస్థల పరికరములుకూడ నంతగా నవసరము లేదు. 'నీలవిళక్కు' అనుపేరుకల ఒకపెద్ద దీపస్తంభము రంగస్థలమును, నందభినయించు నటులను ప్రకాశవంతము చేయును. ప్రతిసన్నివేశ ప్రారంభ పరిసమాప్తులయం దుభయపార్శ్వములయందు నిలిచియున్న యిరువురు వ్యక్తులు తెరను అడ్డముగా పట్టుదురు. ఇరువురు గాయకులు – వారిలో నొకఁడు ప్రధాన గాయకుఁడు, మఱొకడు సహాయ గాయకుఁడు – నలుగురు వాద్యగాండ్రు కలసి ఆట్టక్కథలోని పాటలను పాడుచుండగా రంగస్థలములపై నటులు ఆయా భావముల కనుగుణము లయిన ముద్రలతో భావాభినయము గావింతురు. కథకు సంబంధించిన పౌరాణికపాత్రల ప్రకృతి కనుగుణముగా ప్రత్యేకమయిన వేషధారణమును కూడ వారు చేయుచుండిరి. ధీరోదాత్తుఁ డయిన నాయకుఁడు అకుపచ్చవన్నె గల దుస్తులు ధరించును. అసురవేషధారులు కత్తి లేక రక్తవర్ణముకల దుస్తులను. వేటగాండ్రు బొగ్గువలె నల్లనైన దుస్తులను, ఉన్మాదులు గడ్డమును, స్త్రీలు, సన్యాసులు, బ్రాహ్మణులు మొదలగువారు మినుకుమినుకు మని ప్రకాశించు దుస్తులను ధరించుచుండిరి. ముఖమునకు రంగు పూసి

అను రసముల నిర్వహణమునకు బొత్తిగా నవకాశము లేకపోయెను. ఇంత మాత్రమే కాక యిందు గాత్ర సంగీతమునకు గాని వాద్యసంగీతమునకు గాని యంతగా ప్రాధాన్యము లేకుండెను. ఈ లోపముల నెల్ల సరిదిద్దుకొని ప్రేక్షకులకు సర్వవిధములుగా నానందము కలిగించు 'ఆట్టక్కథ' కొట్టారకార తంబురాన్ చే రచింపబడెను. దానిపేరు 'రామనాట్టం'. ఇది కృష్ణనాట్టం కంటె సర్వవిధముల మిన్నయై యున్నది. సన్నివేశ ప్రారంభములందున్న అవతారికాపద్యములు సంస్కృతములోఁ గాక మణిప్రవాళశైలిలో రచింపఁబడెను. పాటలు మలయాళభాషలో నున్నవి. నవరసములకును నిందు నిర్వాహము కలదు ధర్మము అధర్మమును జయించునట్లుగా నున్న యితివృత్తము వస్తువుగా స్వీకరింపఁబడెను. ఇదియే తరువాతికాలపు ఆట్టక్కథలకు పరవడి యైనది.

కథకళి స్వరూపము ;

కొట్టారకార తంబురాన్ అనునతఁడు ఈ కథకళి ప్రదర్శనమునకు ఒక వ్యవస్థ కల్పించెను. దీనికి సంబంధించిన ఆట్టక్కథ సాహిత్యపరముగా కూడ మంచి విలువగలదై యుండవలెనను సంప్రదాయ మీతనితో ప్రారంభ మయ్యెను. ప్రతి ఆట్టక్కథయు కొన్ని సన్నివేశములక్రింద విభజింపఁబడును. ప్రతి సన్నివేశ ప్రారంభములోను కథాసూత్రమును తెలుపు పద్య మొకటి సంస్కృతములోను, మణిప్రవాళములోను రచింపఁబడి యుండును. నటీనటుల సంభాషణలు మలయాళమున పాటలరూపములో నుండి విద్వాంసులయిన గాయకులచే సశాస్త్రీయముగా పాడఁబడును. ఇందు నటించు నటులు పురుషులే. పురుషులే స్త్రీ పాత్రలనుకూడ ధరింతురు. వారు పాటలలోనున్న భావములను ముద్రాభినయరూపముతో ప్రదర్శింతురు. దీనికి రంగస్థల పరికరములుకూడ నంతగా నవసరము లేదు. 'నీలవిళక్కు' అనుపేరుకల ఒకపెద్ద దీపస్తంభము రంగస్థలమును, నందభినయించు నటులను ప్రకాశవంతము చేయును. ప్రతిసన్నివేశ ప్రారంభ పరిసమాప్తులయం దుభయపార్శ్వములయందు నిలిచియున్న యిరువురు వ్యక్తులు తెరను అడ్డముగా పట్టుదురు. ఇరువురు గాయకులు - వారిలో నొకఁడు ప్రధాన గాయకుఁడు, మఱొకడు సహాయ గాయకుఁడు - నలుగురు వాద్యగాండ్రు కలసి ఆట్టక్కథలోని పాటలను పాడుచుండగా రంగస్థలముపై నటులు ఆయా భావముల కనుగుణము లయిన ముద్రలతో భావాభినయము గావింతురు. కథకు సంబంధించిన పౌరాణికపాత్రల ప్రకృతి కనుగుణముగా ప్రత్యేకమయిన వేషధారణమును కూడ వారు చేయుచుండిరి. ధీరోదాత్తుఁ డయిన నాయకుఁడు ఆకుపచ్చవన్నె గల దుస్తులు ధరించును. అసురవేషధారులు కత్తి లేక రక్తవర్ణముకల దుస్తులను, వేటగాండ్రు బొగ్గువలె నల్లనైన దుస్తులను, ఉన్మాదులు గడ్డమును, స్త్రీలు, సన్యాసులు, బ్రాహ్మణులు మొదలగువారు మినుకుమినుకు మని ప్రకాశించు దుస్తులను ధరించుచుండిరి. ముఖమునకు రంగు పూసి

కొనుట కూడ వారి వేషధారణములో నొకభాగము. దానికి మలయాళమునందు 'చుట్టికుత్తు' అనిపేరు.

'Kathakali is neither simply a Natya (acting) nor exclusively a Nritta (dancing). It may be apter to describe it as Nritya – the contribution of acting, dancing and Music...... In Kathakali there is Nritya, there is music, there is literature and above all there are the nine Rasas known to Indian aesthetics.'

— *P.K. Parameswaran Nair.*

కొట్టారకార తంబురాన్ తరువాత కథకళి ప్రదర్శనమున కవసరమైన ఆట్టక్కథ సారస్వతము మిక్కిలి తీవ్రగతితో నభివృద్ధి చెంద నారంభించినది. అనేక కవులీరచనాప్రక్రియను చేపట్టి మలయాళమున పెక్కు ఆట్టక్కథలను రచించిరి. కాని వానిలో పెక్కు అంత ప్రశస్తమయిన రచనలు కావు. మఱికొన్ని సాహిత్యపరముగా చూచినపుడు ప్రశస్తములయినవే యయినను ప్రదర్శనమున కవి యంత గొప్పగా నుండక పోవుట కానవచ్చును. ఇట్లు పెక్కు ఆట్టక్కథలు రచింపఁబడినను వానిలో చాల స్వల్పముగా మాత్రమే సర్వలక్షణ సమన్వితములయిన ఆట్టక్కథలు. ఇట్టివానిలో ఉణ్ణాయి వారియర్ రచించిన నలచరిత్రము ప్రశస్తమయిన రచనము. తిరువాన్కూరు ప్రభువగు కార్తిక తిరునాళ్ ఉణ్ణాయి వారియర్ మొదలగు ఆట్టక్కథా రచయితలను పోషించుట మాత్రమేకాక తానే స్వయముగా ఏడు ఆట్టక్కథలను రచించెను. రాజసూయము, నరకాసురవధము సుభద్రాహరణము మొదలగునవి వానిలో ప్రసిద్ధిచెందినవి. అతఁడు తన రాజప్రాసాదమున 'కొట్టారం కథకళియోగం' అను పేరుతో ఒక సంస్థను స్థాపించి కథకళికి చక్కని ప్రోత్సాహము నొసగెను. అతఁడు అభినయమునందును, వేషధారణమునందును పెక్కు సంస్కరణములు కావించుటమాత్రమేకాక తిరువనంతపురమునందలి పద్మనాభస్వామి దేవాలయమున జరుగు తిరునాళ్లలో ప్రతి సంవత్సరము కథకళి ప్రదర్శనము విధిగా నుండునట్లేర్పాటు గావించెను. నేఁటికిని ఆ సంస్థయు, నా యాచారమును నిలిచియే యున్నది. త్యాగరాజస్వామి సమకాలికుఁడగు స్వాతి తిరునాళ్ మహారాజు కాలములోఁగూడ ఈ కథకళి ప్రదర్శనమునకు చక్కని ప్రోత్సాహము లభించెను. అతడు బహుభాషావేత్త యయినను మహావిద్వాంసుడు. అతడు స్వయముగా 'ఆట్టక్కథా' రచనము చేయఁబోయినను ఇరయమ్మన్ తంబి మొదలగు ఆట్టక్కథ రచయితలకు విశేష సత్కారము గావించి వారి రచనలకు చక్కని దోహదము కల్పించెను. అతని తరువాత రాజ్యమునకు వచ్చిన ఉత్రం తిరుమార్తాండవర్మ తిరునాళ్ కూడ కథకళికి గొప్ప ప్రోత్సాహము నొసగెను. అతఁడు రాజప్రాసాదములోని కథకళి నాట్యసంఘములో కొన్ని సంస్కరణములను ప్రవేశపెట్టుటే కాక తొలిసారిగా 58 ఆట్టక్కథలను ముద్రింపఁజేసి ప్రకటించెను.

ఇటు కొట్టారకారతంబురాన్ కాలమునుండి తిరువనంతపుర ప్రభువులకాలము దాఁక కల యీ మధ్యకాలము ఆట్టక్కథాప్రక్రియకు స్వర్ణయుగముగా పరిణమించినది. తరువాత రాజపోషణము సన్నగిల్లుటతో ఈప్రదర్శనమును, దానికి వలసిన ఆట్టక్కథా సాహిత్యమును కొంత వెనుకపడగా 20 వ శతాబ్ది ప్రారంభమున మలయాళజాతీయ మహాకవి యగు వల్లథోళ్ నారాయణమీనన్ అనునతఁడు నాలుగు దశాబ్దములకు పూర్వము 'కేరళ కళా మండలము' అనుపేరుతో నొకసంస్థను స్థాపించి దానిద్వారా కథకళి ప్రదర్శనమునకు విశేషప్రచారము, ప్రపంచప్రఖ్యాతి లభింపఁజేసెను.

'The untiring efforts of the Mahakavi and his institution have now won for 'Kathakali' an audience not only in Kerala or India, but even beyond the seas in Europe, in America and in the eastern countries...... Though it is not easy for non-malayalis to understand or enjoy its many charms fully it being rooted in the language and traditions of Kerala has that transcendent merit of all the noble art forms which defies the barriers of time and territory and makes a direct appeal to the aesthetic sense of a receptive audience...... It is thus a significant contribution which Kerala had made to the world of art through its Kathakali.

— *P. K. Parameswaran Nair.*

ఆధార గ్రంథములు :

1. Indian Literature — *Ed. by Dr. Nagendra.*
2. A History of Kanerese Literature — *By E. P. Rice.*
   Pub. by The Heritage of Indian Series.
3. History of Malayalam Literature – *By P.K. Parameswaran Nair.*
   Pub. by Sahitya Akademi, NEW DELHI.
4. దక్షిణదేశ సాహిత్యములు — *Pub. by A.P. Sahitya Akademi*, Hyderabad (A. P.)

SRI K. DAKSHINA MURTY

అద్వైత వేదాంత సిద్ధాంతతత్త్వము*

అనాదినుండియు ఆధ్యాత్మవిద్యాపరిశోధనలలో భారతదేశము ముందంజలు వేసినది. ఈ పరిశోధనల ఫలితములన్నియు వేదములలో గర్భితములయి యున్నవి. ఆ వేదములు సంస్కృతభాషలో గలవు. కనుక మనము సంస్కృతభాష నెఱుగవలయును. అప్పుడే మనము మనకు వారసత్త్వముగ తాత ముత్తాతల నుండియు సంక్రమించిన ఆ ఆధ్యాత్మవిద్యాసంపదను సంపూర్ణాధికారముతో అనుభవింపగలము. విధినిషేధములుగల యింటికి యజమానుడయి అందే నివసించువాడయ్యును ఆ విధినిషేధముల జాడల నెఱుగని యజమానుడు దరిద్రదామోదరుడే కద! భాగ్యవంతుడు కానేరడు. సంస్కృతభాష నెఱుగనినాడు మనము ఆ గృహయజమానునకు సహోదరులమే కాగలము.

పై విధముగ మనకు సంక్రమించిన ఆధ్యాత్మికవిద్యాసంపదలో మనము పాటించునదియు, నేడు ఈ సభలో ముచ్చటింప నిశ్చయించుకొన్నదియు అద్వైత వేదాంత విద్యాసంప్రదాయము. అద్వైతమనగా ద్వైతము లేనిదశ. ద్వైతమనగా భేదము. ఈ తత్త్వమును బోధించు వేదాంతమునకు అద్వైత వేదాంతమని పేరు. ఏ వేదాంతమయినను జీవబ్రహ్మ ప్రపంచములకు గల పరస్పరసంబంధ బాంధవ్యములనుగూర్చి ముచ్చటించును. ఇదమిత్థమని సిద్ధాంతీకరించును. అద్వైత వేదాంతము సయితము అట్లు చేయును. ఈ సిద్ధాంతతత్త్వమును చూరగొని సూక్ష్మదృష్టితో పరిశీలించిన పెద్దలు ఆ సిద్ధాంతసారమును మూడు మాటలలో :—

"బ్రహ్మ సత్యమ్ ; జగన్మిథ్యా ;
జీవో బ్రహ్మైవ నాపరః" అని నుడివిరి

బ్రహ్మము కంటికి గనబడదు ; ప్రపంచము కనబడును ఆ కనబడని బ్రహ్మము సత్య

* This is an address to the Rotary Club, Tirupati on 22-4-1970.

మనియు, ఈ కనబడు ప్రపంచమంతయు మిథ్య అనియు పై మూడుమాటలలో తొలి రెండు మాటలకు నర్థము. కనబడనిది కలదనుటయు కనబడునది లేదనుటయు వినువారలకు విప రీతముగ దోచును. కనుకనే లోకులు సయితము ఇట్టి విపరీతవాదినిగూర్చి వానిది అద్వైత మనియు పరిహాసింతురు. ఈ సందర్భవమున శ్రీమద్భగవద్గీతయు :—

యా నిశా సర్వభూతానాం
  తస్యాం జాగర్తి సంయమీ ।
యస్యాం జాగ్రతి భూతాని
  సా నిశా పశ్యతో మునేః ॥ అనెను.

సమస్త ప్రాణులకు పరంబ్రహ్మము రాత్రి ; రాత్రి వంటిది. రాత్రి అనునది స్వతస్సిద్ధముగ తమోమయము. కనుక అప్పట్టున సంచరించు ప్రాణులను కలవరపటుచును. అందున సామాన్య జనులకు పరంబ్రహ్మము వ్యవహారయోగ్యము గాదు. మఱియు సామాన్య ముగ మనుష్యులకు పగటికాల మయ్యును నిశాచరులకు ఆ పగటికాలము రాత్రియే గద ! ఇంతియకాక సామాన్యజనులు మాయావిలసితమయిన ఈ ప్రపంచమున వ్యవహరింతురు. జ్ఞానికి ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచము నొక కలవంటిది. కనుక జ్ఞాని ఈ ప్రపంచ విషయమున నిద్రించు చుండును ; ప్రాపంచికవ్యవహారములను చేయడు. అతడు ప్రాపంచిక వ్యవహార ములను చేయురీతి నగపడుట యంతయు కలలయందలి వ్యవహారము వంటిదియే.

బ్రహ్మ స్వరూపమునుగూర్చి తైత్తిరీయము, ఆనందవల్లి అను నామాంతరము గల బ్రహ్మవల్లి యందు :—

"సత్యం జ్ఞాన మనంతం బ్రహ్మ" అనెను.

బ్రహ్మము జ్ఞానరూపము ; అనంతము ; సత్యము భూతభవిష్యద్వర్తమానకాల ములయందెట్టి మారుదలయు లేకుండుదానిని సత్యము అందురు. ఈ బ్రహ్మము త్రికాల ములయందు నట్లయుండును కనుక బ్రహ్మము సత్యము.

ఈ సృష్టికి బూర్వము బ్రహ్మము గలదు. కనుకనే ఈ సృష్టిని గావించెను. వర్తమాన కాలమందును బ్రహ్మము గలదు కనుకనే ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచమును పాలించు చున్నది. అంత్యకాలమున సయితము బ్రహ్మమే ఈ సమస్తప్రపంచమును తుద ముట్టించును. మరియు ముందు యుగములయందు మరల నీ ప్రపంచమును సృజించును. కనుక బ్రహ్మము త్రికాలములయందు నుండును; ఏ విధమయిన మారుదలయు లేక ఉండును. కనుకనే వేదాంత ములు, ఈ బ్రహ్మమును గూర్చి :—

"న కర్మణా వర్ధతే నో కనీయాన్" అనును.

సృష్టిస్థితిసంహారములను చేయుచున్నను ఈ బ్రహ్మమునందు అపచయాభివృద్ధులు లేవు కనుకనే ఈ బ్రహ్మమునకు అంతము లేదు ; కనుక అనంతము. ఈ బ్రహ్మమును గూర్చి ముండకోపనిషత్ :—

"తదే తత్సత్యం తద మృతమ్" అనెను.

'సత్యమవితథం అతోఽమృతం అవినాశి' అని శ్రీమచ్ఛంకర భగవత్పాదులు వ్యాఖ్యానించిరి.

ప్రపంచము సృష్టికి పూర్వము లేదు ; ప్రళయమునకు పిమ్మట నుండదు. వర్తమాన దశయందు మాత్రము కనబడుచున్నది. కనుక ప్రపంచమును సత్యమని చెప్పజాలము. తొలి తుది దశలయందు లేనిది మధ్య దశయందును లేనిదే. ఆద్యంతదశలయందు లేక మధ్య దశయందు మాత్రము ఉండునది మిథ్య అని అద్వైతవాదుల సిద్ధాంతము. కనుకనే గౌడపాదాచార్యులు తమ కారికయందలి వైతథ్య ప్రకరణమున :—

ఆదా వంతే చ య న్నాస్తి
వర్తమానేఽపి తత్తథా ।
వితథైస్సదృశాస్సంతోఽ
వితథా ఇవ లక్షితాః ॥ అనిరి.

ఎండమావులయందు నీరు తొలిదశలో నుండదు ; మలిదశలో నుండదు ; మధ్య దశయందు మాత్రము కనబడుచుండును. ఆ కనబడు నీరు మిథ్య. ఈ ప్రాపంచిక వస్తువులన్నియు ఆ ఎండమావులయందలి నీటివగిది ఆద్యంతదశలయందు లేనివే. కనుక ఆ ఎండమావులయందలి నీటివలె ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచము మిథ్యయే.

మరియు స్వప్న దశయందు రథగజతురగాదు లేవియును లేవు. ఈ సందర్భమున వేదాంతములు :—

"న తత్ర రథా న రథయోగా న పంథానః
అథ రథాన్ రథయోగాన్ పథః సృజతే" అనును.

స్వప్నదశకు పూర్వము ఆ స్వప్నమున గనబడు రథగజతురగాదులేవియు లేవు. మేల్కాంచిన పిమ్మట జాగ్రద్దశయందును లేవు మధ్యదశయందు మాత్రము కనబడుచున్నవి. ఈ స్వప్నమున గనబడునది అంతయు కేవలము కల్ల యని మనమెఱుగనిదికాదు.

పాంథుడొక్కడు ప్రయాణబడలికచే ఆకలిదప్పులకు లోనయి మధ్యేమార్గము నందొక చెట్టుసీడను సేదదీర్చికొనుచు ఆవులించుచు సొమ్మసిలి కన్నులుమూసి కలలో క్షుత్పిపాసలు తీరునట్లు తనివితీర మృష్టాన్నముల నారగించియు దివ్యపానీయములను గ్రోలియు పరమానందభరితుడయ్యెను ఆవురావురనుచు మేల్కాంచును గద ! కలలో తాను తినిన తిండియు ద్రావిన పానీయములును గల్లలనుట పై నిదర్శనముచే తేటతెల్లము.

ఈ ప్రపంచము సయితము ఆద్యంతదశలయందు లేదు. మధ్యదశయందు మాత్రము కనబడుచున్నది కనుక స్వప్నమున గనబడు వస్తువులవలె ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచము మిథ్య.

మరియు కలలు స్వప్నావస్థతో నారంభములగును : మేల్కాంచుటతో నంతము లగును. కనుక కలలు ఆద్యంతములు గలవి : మరియు మిథ్యలు. కనుక ఆద్యంతములు గలవి అన్నియు మిథ్యలే అనియు అద్వైతవాదుల సిద్ధాంతము ఈ ప్రపంచమునకు సయితము ఆదియు నంతమును గలదు. కనుక ఈ ప్రపంచమంతయు మిథ్య. ఈ సందర్భమున గౌడపాదులు :—

"మాయామాత్ర మిదం ద్వైత
మద్వైతం పరమార్థతః" అనిరి.

బ్రహ్మమునకు ఆదియు నంతమును లేదు. కనుకనే వేదాంతము :—

"అనాద్యనంతం మహతః పరం ధ్రువమ్" అనెను.

కనుక బ్రహ్మము సత్యము ; ప్రపంచము మిథ్య

ఇంతియకాక కొందఱు పగటికాలమున మేల్కొనియుండియు తదేక మనస్సుతో నాలోచించుచు జాగ్రద్దశయందే కలలు గనుచుందురు. ఈ కలలను నవ్వుగింజ కథకు పోల్ప వచ్చును. ఇట్టి కలలను ఆంగ్లమున 'Building castles in the air' అందురు. సంస్కృతభాషయందిట్టి కలలను గంధర్వ నగరములందుము. ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచము స్వప్నేంద్రజాలగంధర్వనగరములకు తుల్యమే అని అద్వైతతత్త్వ విచక్షణుల తాత్పర్యము. ఈ విషయమున గౌడపాదులు :—

స్వప్నమాయే యథా దృష్టే
గంధర్వనగరం యథా ।
తథా విశ్వమిదం దృష్టం
వేదాంతేషు విచక్షణైః ॥ అనిరి.

కాని జాగరితము నందలి అన్నపానాదులు ఆకలిదప్పులను పోగొట్టగలవనియు జాగరితమునందలి రథగజతురగాదివాహనములు రాకపోకలకు నుపయోగపడగలవనియు అందుచే నివి స్వప్నమునందలి అన్నపానవాహనాదులకు తుల్యములు కావు అనియు గొందఱు తలంపవచ్చును. అనగా స్వప్నప్రపంచము మిథ్య కావచ్చునేకాని జాగరిత ప్రపంచము మిథ్య కాజాలదని వారు అభిప్రాయపడుదురు. వారి అభిప్రాయము సరియైనదిగాదు. కారణమేమన గలలయందు మృష్టాన్నముల నారగించి తృప్తుడయ్యును ఆకొని అవురావు రనుచు మేల్కొనువాని రీతి పగటిపూట తనివితీరదిని పరుండి కలలో అనేక దినము లుపవసించిన యట్లుల నుకొనుచు ఆకటి బాధకు కటకటపడుటయు మన యనుభవములోనిదే. కనుక ఈ జాగరిత ప్రపంచమునకు స్వప్నప్రపంచముతో సర్వవిధముల సాదృశ్యముకలదు. కనుక కలలవలె జాగరితమంతయు కల్లయే.

మరియు తానులేని తావున తానగపడునది మిథ్య అనియు అద్వైతవాదుల సిద్ధాంతము. సర్పముకాని రజ్జువును మందాంధకారమున జూచి సర్పమని భ్రమింతుము. ఆ ప్రదేశమున త్రాడు కలదు; కాని పాములేదు. దీపముదెచ్చి త్రాటిని చూచినపిమ్మట పాము కాదనియు ఆ కనబడిన పాము త్రాడు మాత్రమే అనియు మనము అందుము. కనుకనే :—

అనిశ్చితా యథా రజ్జు
రంధకారే వికల్పితా ।
సర్పధారాదిభి ర్భావై
స్తద్వ దాత్మా వికల్పితః ॥

నిశ్చితాయాం యథారజ్జ్వాం
వికల్పో వినివర్తతే ।
రజ్జు రేవే తిచాద్వైతం
తద్వదాత్మ వినిశ్చయః ॥ అని పెద్దలనానుడి.

పాములేని తావున పాము కనబడుచున్నది కనుక పాము మిథ్య. ఇట్లే ముత్తెపు జిప్పను చూచి వెండి అనియు భ్రమింతుము. ఆ తావున ముత్తెపుజిప్ప కలదు; కాని వెండి లేదు. వెండి లేనితావున వెండి కనబడుచున్నది. కనుక ఆ వెండియు మిథ్య ఈ కనబడు పాము కనబడుటకు పూర్వము రజ్జువే; వెండియు ముత్తెపుజిప్పయే. అట్లే ఈ ప్రపంచమంతయు పుట్టుటకు పూర్వము సద్రూపమయిన బ్రహ్మముగనే ఉండెను. ఈ సందర్భమున ఛాందోగ్యము :—

"సదేవ సోమ్య ఇదమగ్ర ఆసీత్" అనెను

అనగా మనము త్రాటిని చూచుటకు బదులుగ పామును, ముత్తెపుజిప్పను చూచుటకు బదులుగ వెండిని చూచుచుంటిమి. అట్లే బ్రహ్మమును చూచుటకు బదులుగ ఈ ప్రపంచమును జూచుచుంటిమి. త్రాడు ముత్తెపుజిప్ప మున్నగువాని తత్త్వము నెఱిగిన వెంటనే పాము, వెండి మొదలగునవి మటుమాయమగును, మెలకువ కలిగిన వెంటనే కలలన్నియు కల్లలే కద ! అట్లే బ్రహ్మము నెఱిగినవెంటనే ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచము రూపుమాయును. ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచము బ్రహ్మమే ; కాని వేఱొండు గాదు. ఈ సందర్భమున ముండకము:—

"బ్రహ్మైవేద మమృతం పురస్తాత్
బ్రహ్మ పశ్చా ద్బ్రహ్మ దక్షిణత శ్చో
త్తరేణ అధశ్చోర్ధ్వం చ ప్రసృతం
బ్రహ్మైవేదం విశ్వమిదం వరిష్ఠమ్" అనెను.

మాండూక్యము నయితము :—

"సర్వం హ్యేత ద్బ్రహ్మ" అనెను.

తెలియుట పరోక్షముగ దెలియుట, అపరోక్షముగ దెలియుట అను భేదముతో రెండు తెగలు ఇతరులు చెప్పగ విని కొండదరి చెట్టుక్రింద పండ్లు గలవని మనము తెలియుదుము. ఈ తెలియుటను పరోక్షజ్ఞానము అందుము. మనమే కొండదరికేగి చెట్టుక్రింద పండ్లను కనుగొందుము. ఈ తెలియుటను అపరోక్షజ్ఞానము అందుము.

సంజవేళ గృహాభిముఖుడై వచ్చిన గృహయజమానుని పుత్రుడు గుమ్మముచెంతనొక త్రాటిని సర్పమని భ్రమించి భయకంపితుడయి 'పాము' అని బొబ్బలిడెను. తిన్నెపై గూర్చొనియున్న తండ్రి తనపుత్రుని కేకను విని 'నాయనా ! అది ఇంతకు మునుపు నేను పడవేసిన త్రాడు కాని పాముగాదు' అనును. ఏ తండ్రియు పామును పాము గాదని చెప్పి పుత్రునకు ద్రోహము తలపోయడు. ఈతత్త్వము నెఱిగనవాడయ్యును పుత్రుడు అచట సర్పమును దాని పడగను దాని కదలికమెదలికలను తన కన్నులారా జూచుచు తన తండ్రిమాటలను నమ్మజాలడు; నమ్మి ఒక్క అడుగయినను ముందుకు సాగిపోజాలడు. అనగా నతనికి సర్పభ్రమము అపరోక్షముగ నున్నది. తండ్రిచెప్పిన 'పాము గాదు' అను మాటలవలన గలుగు జ్ఞానము పరోక్షము. పరోక్షజ్ఞానమునకు అపరోక్షభ్రమను తొలగించు బలములేదు. అపరోక్షభ్రమను అపరోక్షజ్ఞానమే తొలగింపగలదు. కనుకనే తండ్రివంటి ఆప్తుడు చెప్పినను అతడు పాముగాదని విశ్వసింపలేడు.

అట్లే గురువునొద్ద వేదాంతముల నభ్యసింపవచ్చును కాని అందు మూలమున గలుగు అద్వితీయపరబ్రహ్మముయొక్క జ్ఞానము పరోక్షము. ఈ ప్రపంచ భేదము అప

రోక్షముగ కనబడుచున్నది. అద్వితీయ పరబ్రహ్మముయొక్క పరోక్షజ్ఞానము అపరోక్షమయిన ఈప్రపంచ భేదమును తొలగింపజాలదు. అపరోక్షముగ కనుబడుచున్న ఈప్రపంచ భేదమును తొలగించుటకు అద్వితీయ పరంబ్రహ్మము యొక్క అపరోక్ష సాక్షాత్కారమే కావలయును. కనుకనే వేదాంతశ్రవణము జేసినవారికిని ఈ భేదము అనువర్తించుచుండును. అందుచే శ్రవణము గావించినవారు మనననిదిధ్యాసనములనుగూడ జేసి అద్వితీయ బ్రహ్మసాక్షాత్కారమును సంపాదింప ఈ ప్రపంచ భేదము సమూలము నశించును అప్పుడే సాధకుడు ద్వైతమెంతమాత్రము లేని అద్వైత దశనందును :—

"యస్మిం త్సర్వాణి భూతాని
ఆత్మైవాభూ ద్విజానతః ।
తత్ర కో మోహః కః శోకః
ఏకత్వ మనుపశ్యతః" అని వేదాంతము.

జీవుడు బ్రహ్మముకన్న వేరుగాడు ; బ్రహ్మమే అని తొలి మూడు మాటలలోఁ 'జీవో బ్రహ్మైవ నాపరః' అను మూడవ మాటకు అర్థము.

ఆ బ్రహ్మము ఈ సమస్త ప్రపంచమును సృజించి తానీ ప్రపంచమున బ్రవేశించెను కనుకనే ఛాందోగ్యము :—

"తత్ సృష్ట్వా తదేవా నుప్రావిశత్" అనెను.

మరియు బ్రహ్మము ఈ జీవరూపముతో బ్రవేశించి తాను సృజించిన ప్రపంచమును విపులీకరింతుననియు సంకల్పించెను :—

"అనేన జీవే నాత్మ నానుప్రవిశ్య
నామరూపే వ్యాకరవాణి" అని వేదాంతము.

కనుక ఆ బ్రహ్మమే జీవుడు మరియు :—

"ఏష దేవో విశ్వకర్మా మహాత్మా సదా
జనానాం హృదయే సన్నివిష్టః" అని వేదాంతములు చాటును.

కనుక జీవుడే పరంబ్రహ్మము. అందుచే జీవుడు తనను తానెఱిగిన వెంటనే తాను బ్రహ్మమగును.

"స యోహవై తత్పరమం బ్రహ్మ వేద
బ్రహ్మైవ భవతి" అని వేదాంతము

మరియు ప్రసూతివైద్యశాలలో ప్రసూతులయిన పాపలను, సూతికావేదనలతో అలసిసొలసి సొక్కి ఇవతలవతల మంచములపై పడియున్న తల్లులకు వినిమయము గావించుటయు మనమెఱుగనిది గాదు. రాజాంతఃపురములయందు గూడ ఇట్టి మార్పులు సంభవించుచుండెడివనియు మనము పౌరాణిక గాథల మూలమున వినుచుందుము. రాకుమారు డొక్కడు ఇట్టి మార్పునకు లోనయి కోయజాతివారి చేతబడి పెరుగుచు పెద్దయై తాను కోయజాతివాడ ననుకొనుచుండును. నిజమునకతడు రాజకుమారుడు. ఒకానొక యోగిపుంగవుడీతత్త్వమును తన దివ్యదృష్టితో నెఱిగి దయామయుడై ఆ బోయగనున్న రాకుమారుని తోడ్కొని రాజసభకేగి అతడు రాజపుత్రుడని నిరూపింప వెంటనే ఆ బోయడు శ్వేతచ్ఛత్రాది రాజలక్షణ సంపన్నుడై రాజగును. అట్లే జీవుడు గూడ తాను బ్రహ్మమయ్యును ఆతత్త్వమును మఱచి సంసారసాగరమున బడి నానాతిప్పలు బడుచు విసికివేసారి విరక్తి జెంది యథావిధి గురూపసదనము జేసి అతని యనుగ్రహము వడసి తానే బ్రహ్మమని తెలిసి తరతరములుగ తననుచుట్టుముట్టి అలముకొని ముప్పుతిప్పలు బెట్టు ఈ సకలసంసారబంధములను చెల్లచెదరుగ తెగదెంపి బ్రహ్మమగును. ఇదియే అద్వైత సిద్ధాంత తత్త్వము.

Dr. R. K. JAIN

भारतीय काव्यशास्त्र की रूपरेखा

रचनात्मक साहित्य की भांति आलोचनात्मक या काव्यसिद्धान्त प्रतिपादक साहित्य की भी भारत की अपनी सुदीर्घ (सवा दो सहस्र वर्षों की) एवं स्वस्थ परम्परा है। पाश्चात्य साहित्यालोचन के प्रामाणिक आदिस्रोत अरिस्टोटल हैं तो भारतीय काव्यशास्त्र के मूर्धन्य, सशक्त सूत्रधार आचार्य भरतमुनि हैं। संस्कृत भाषा में ही हमारे काव्यशस्त्रीय ग्रन्थों का प्रणयन प्रारम्भ हुआ था और सहस्रों वर्षों तक चलता भी रहा। विभिन्न भारतीय भाषाओं और विशेषत: हिन्दी भाषा में यह परम्परा आज भी जीवन संचरित कर रही है, यद्यपि इन सभी भाषाओं में मौलिक रचनाएं और सिद्धान्तस्थापनाएं प्राय: दुर्लभ हैं। संस्कृत काव्यशास्त्र के उद्भव और विकास की समीक्षा के पूर्व उसके स्वरूप, पृष्ठभूमि, विषय और सीमा को समझलेना अत्यन्त वान्छनीय है। इसके बिना पाठक के दिग्भ्रमित हो जाने की अधिक संभावनाएं हैं।

स्वरूप -

काव्य और साहित्य शब्द सुदीर्घ काल से प्राय: समानार्थी रहे हैं। अत: इनके सिद्धान्त पक्ष पर विचार करनेवाले शास्त्र को काव्यशास्त्र तथा साहित्यशास्त्र की संज्ञा मिलती रही है। यह तथ्य भी ज्ञातव्य है कि संस्कृत-काव्यशास्त्र प्राय: अलंकार से निर्दिष्ट हुआ हैं अत: अनेक ग्रन्थों का नामकरण भी इसी आधार पर हुआ है – यथा – काव्यालंकार, काव्यादर्श, काव्यमीमांसा, अलंकारसूत्र

आदि । एतद् विषयक सभी ग्रन्थों को अलंकार ग्रन्थ ही समझा जाता रहा है; यद्यपि इन ग्रन्थों में अलंकारों के अतिरिक्त काव्य के अनेक अन्य सिद्धान्तों पर भी विचार किया गया है । प्रमुखता अलंकार की रही है अत: नामकरण में भी उसका प्रामुख्य रहा । ज्यों ज्यों हमारा अध्ययन, मनन और विवेचन वैज्ञानिक तथा वैशिष्ट्य मूलक होता गया हमने नामकरण में भी वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि को स्वीकार किया । अत: काव्य के समस्त सिद्धान्त पक्ष एवं व्यवहार पक्ष पर शास्त्रीय दृष्टि से विचार करनेवाले तथा सिद्धान्तस्थापन करनेवाले शास्त्र को 'काव्यशास्त्र' की संज्ञा ही समीचीन स्वीकृत हुई । काव्यशास्त्र की परिभाषा विद्वानों, विश्वकोषों तथा कोषों के आधार पर द्रष्टव्य है ।

"Poetics is a treatise on poetry as an art; a theory of poetry."

[*W. New International Dictionary*]

अर्थात् काव्य की कलात्मकता का निबन्धन या काव्यसिद्धान्त ही काव्यशास्त्र है । आक्सफोर्ड डिक्शनरी के अनुसार –

"Poetics. the part of literary criticism which treats of poetry, also a trealise on poetry."

अर्थात् काव्यशास्त्र, साहित्यिक आलोचना का वह भाग है जो काव्य पर विचार करता है, वह काव्य पर एक विधिवत् निबन्ध भी है ।

निष्कर्ष रूप में काव्य के सिद्धान्त और व्यवहार पक्षों का ध्यान रख कर हम कह सकते हैं कि काव्य शास्त्र वह विचार संस्था है जिस में काव्य के रूप, भेद, संरचना तथा समस्याओं पर वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि से विचार किया जाता है काव्य-व्यवस्था का नियामक एवं संपोषक शास्त्र काव्यशास्त्र है । स्वरूप, प्रवृत्ति और प्रभावकता पर काव्यशास्त्र के अन्तर्गत यापक विचार होता है । वस्तुत: काव्य यदि दृश्य है तो काव्यशास्त्र उसे सुस्पष्ट करनेवाली एक भव्यदृष्टि है ।

पृष्ठभूमि –

काव्यशास्त्र की पृष्ठभूमि या मूलाधार द्विविध है । एक ओर वह साहित्य-

कार में सृजन की उदात्तता एवं व्यवस्था को उद्वेलित करता है तो दूसरी ओर आस्वादयिता को भी विशिष्ट रुचि अर्थात् आस्वादन-क्षमता प्रदान करता है। इसका आशय यह है कि आस्वादक की रसग्रहण एवं कलानुमोदन की बीजरूप अव्यक्त सामर्थ्य को काव्यशास्त्र चिर अपेक्षित जलवायु प्रदान करता है। काव्य-शास्त्र की पृष्ठभूमि यदि सैद्धान्तिक या भावात्मक दृष्टि से हम जानना चाहें तो दो तथ्यों पर सहज ही हमारा ध्यान जाता है। प्रथम यह है कि हमारी समस्त चिन्तनधारा विषयमूलक है, रसमूलक है, घटनामूलक है; उसमें व्यक्ति की विचारणा, उसके विकसित चिन्तन और बदलते भावात्मक निजी आयामों को कोई अवसर नहीं। फलस्वरूप यह पद्धति हमें आदर्शवादी ही बनाती है और वैज्ञानिक होने से रोकती है। हमारा स्थायी तथ्यान्वेषण का आग्रह और तथ्य निरूपण की प्रकामता हमें सदा एक ही आदर्शवादी चिन्तन पद्धति में डालती है। यहीं ध्यान देने की दूसरी बात यह है कि हम अपने प्रत्येक चिन्तन को या तथ्यान्वेषण को महत्ता और स्थायित्व प्रदान करने के लिए उसे एक प्राचीन दार्शनिक सत्य से बांधते हैं। अत: स्पष्ट है कि भारतीय काव्यशास्त्र के दो सुदृढ आधार हैं — (१) वस्तुमूलकता और (२) आदर्शवादिता। इन आधारों को हम एक अन्य दृष्टिकोण से कलात्मक एवं दार्शनिक भी कह सकते हैं। भारतीय अलंकार, रीति और वक्रोक्ति सम्प्रदाय मूलत: काव्य के बाह्य को ही काव्य का सर्वस्व मानते हैं अत: वे मूलत: कलात्मक हैं। दूसरी ओर आचार्यों ने जहाँ काव्य की आत्मा या वस्तुनिष्ठता पर ध्यान दिया है वहाँ सहज ही उनका आधार दार्शनिक हो गया है। ध्वनि और रस सम्प्रदाय अपनी वस्तुनिष्ठता के कारण दार्शनिकता से आबद्ध हैं। ध्वनि ब्रह्मनाद है और रस ब्रह्मानन्द सहोदर यह स्थापना सुविदित ही है। इससे ध्वनि और रस के मूल में दार्शनिकता सिद्ध होती है।

विषय —

ललित रचनात्मक साहित्य के कला एवं भाव पक्ष की प्रकृति तथा प्रवृत्ति को स्पष्ट करना; आवश्यक सिद्धान्तों और नियमों का निर्धारण तथा विवेचन अथ च स्रष्टा और पाठक की सम्बन्ध स्थापना काव्यशास्त्र का विषय है। भाषा की विषयानुकूलता, सौष्ठव, शैलीगत अभिरामता, अलंकरण का औचित्य तथा भावों की उदात्तता आदि पर स्रष्टा और आस्वादयिता को एक वैज्ञानिक अथ च सहृदयता पूर्ण

सैद्धान्तिक व्यवस्था ही काव्यशास्त्र की परिधि है। सिद्धान्तकार अपने समय और परिस्थितियों की छाया में ही किसी व्यवस्था अथवा सिद्धान्त का प्रणयन करता है; फिर भी वह उस व्यवस्था में स्थायी मूल्यों का पूर्ण ध्यान रखता है। निष्कर्षत: काव्यशास्त्र का विषय काव्य के विभिन्न रूपों और उनके विविध अंग-प्रत्यंगों पर सैद्धान्तिक व्यवस्था देना है।

सीमा —

काव्यशास्त्र सामान्यत: काव्य से ही आबद्ध नहीं है। उसमें साहित्य के गद्य और पद्य की सभी विधाओं का समाहार होता है वह दृश्य और श्रव्य काव्य दोनों पर अधिकार पूर्वक सैद्धान्तिक व्यवस्था देता है। प्राय: काव्यशास्त्र को काव्य के सैद्धान्तिक पक्ष से ही नहीं बांधा जा सकता है, वह युगानुसार काव्य के व्यवहार पक्ष पर भी एक वैज्ञानिक व्यवस्था देता है। काव्यशास्त्र इससे भी आगे साहित्यकार और आस्वादयिता की भी विभिन्नस्तरीय कसौटियां निश्चित करता है। अत: इस शास्त्र का सीमाक्षेत्र सृजनात्मक साहित्य का सैद्धान्तिक और व्यावहारिक व्यवस्था देने के साथ स्रष्टा और पाठक को समृद्ध दृष्टि देने का महान् आयोजन करता है।

जहाँ तक काव्यशास्त्र के उद्देश्य का प्रश्न है एक ओर वह काव्य के विविधस्तरीय सौन्दर्य को सुस्पष्ट करके जनमानस को साधारणेतर आनन्द से आप्लावित करता है, तो दूसरी ओर स्रष्टा को भी चिरनवीन, शालीन एवं धुरीण सृजन की अभूतपूर्व प्रेरणा देता है। रचयिता और आस्वादयिता के सम्बन्धों को स्वस्थ एवं गतिशील बनाने का ही इस शास्त्र का लक्ष्य है।

भारतीय (संस्कृत) काव्यशास्त्र की रूपरेखा पर दो पद्धतियों से विचार किया जा सकता है। प्रथम पद्धति में व्यक्तिगतरचनाओं पर इतिहास क्रम से विचार हो सकता है और दूसरी पद्धति में केवल सैद्धान्तिक विकास या इतिहास निरपेक्ष सिद्धान्त मूलक अध्ययन हो सकता है। प्रथम पद्धति हमारे लिए अकिंचित्कर होगी, क्योंकि एक ही युग में अनेक विचार धाराओं और सम्प्रदायों के आचार्यों की रचनाओं का सृजन हुआ है। अत: किसी एक ही विचार धारा का व्यवस्थित और पूर्ण अध्ययन इस विधि से संभव नहीं हो सकता। द्वितीय पद्धति के अन्तर्गत हम केवल विचार धारा और सिद्धान्त पर दृष्टि रख सकते हैं। यही पद्धति हमारे

उद्देश्य की सिद्धि में सहायक भी है। अतः हम संस्कृत काव्यशास्त्र के छह शास्त्रीय सम्प्रदायों पर क्रमशः विचार करेंगे। ये छह सम्प्रदाय ही इस धारा का सर्वस्व हैं। ये हैं – रस सम्प्रदाय, अलङ्कार सम्प्रदाय, रीति सम्प्रदाय, ध्वनि सम्प्रदाय, वक्रोक्ति सम्प्रदाय और औचित्य सम्प्रदाय।

रस सम्प्रदाय –

व्युत्पत्ति और अर्थ –

रस शब्द 'रस' धातु से अच् तथा घ प्रत्यय करने पर निष्पन्न होता है। रस शब्द की व्याख्या दो प्रकार से की जा सकती है – १. रस्यते (आस्वाद्यते) इति रसः। अर्थात् जो आस्वादित किया जाय वह रस है। तथा – २. रसते (द्रवति) इतिं रसः। अर्थात् जो प्रवाहित हो वह रस है। ऊपर की गई व्युत्पत्ति से रस में विद्यमान दो तथ्य सम्मुख आते हैं। एक है उसका आस्वाद्यत्व और दूसरा है उसकी द्रवणशीलता। रस शब्द का काव्यानन्द के अर्थ में प्रयोग सर्वप्रथम भरतमुनि ने अपने नाट्यशास्त्र में किया। इस के पूर्व ऋग्वेद[1], उपनिषद्[2] आदि में अन्य अर्थों में इस शब्द का प्रयोग हुआ है।

इतना ही नहीं यह रस शब्द अपनी व्यापकता के कारण और भी अनेक अर्थों में प्रयुक्त हुआ है, यथा –

१. आयुर्वेदीय रस (रसायन)।

२. खाद्य पदार्थ रस - षड्रस (मधुर, कटु, आम्ल, क्षार, काषाय, तिक्त)।

३. भक्तिरस – अध्यात्म रस, ब्रह्मानन्द।

४. धातु - भस्म।

साहित्यिक आनन्द से इतर अर्थ देनेवाले ये सभी अर्थ निष्कर्षित सामूहिक

---

1. "दधानः कलशे रसम्" ऋग्वेद – ८ - ६३ - १३ यह प्रयोग सोम रस के अर्थ में है।

2. "रसो वै सः रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति" तै० उपनिषद् [११ - ७ - १] यह प्रयोग अध्यात्म परक अलौकिक आनन्द के अर्थ में है।

एवं अन्वितिमूलक परिणाम के कारण परोक्षत: साहित्यिक आनन्द की अन्तिम अवस्था (अन्विति मूलकता) का समर्थन करते हैं ।

रस की परिभाषा –

मूर्धन्य आचार्य भरत की परिभाषा है – "विभावानुभावव्यभिचारि संयोगाद्रस-निष्पत्ति: ।" अर्थात् विभाव, अनुभाव और व्यभिचारी (संचारी) भावों के योग से रस निष्पत्ति होती है । यद्यपि इस परिभाषा में स्थायिभाव का उल्लेख नहीं है परन्तु वह सहजगम्य है । आचार्य धनञ्जय ने अपने दशरूपक में परिभाषा में और भी स्पष्टता लाने का यत्न किया है –

विभावैरनुभावैश्च सात्त्विकैर्व्यभिचारिभि: ।
आनीयमान: स्वाद्यत्वं स्थायी भावो रस: स्मृत: ॥ ३।१।

अर्थात् विभाव, अनुभाव, सात्त्विक तथा व्यभिचारी भावों की सहायता से स्वाद्यत्व को प्राप्त हुआ स्थायी भाव रस है । आचार्य मम्मट ने भी यही स्वर ध्वनित किया है – "व्यक्त: सतै: विभावाद्यै: स्थायी भावो रस: स्मृत:" किन्तु मर्मी आचार्य विश्वनाथ ने अपनी परिभाषा में आस्वादयिता के 'सचेतसत्त्व' का भी उल्लेख किया है ।

विभावेनानुभावेन व्यक्त: संचारिणा तथा ।
रसतामेति रत्यादि: स्थायिभाव: सचेतसाम् ॥

आचार्य विश्वनाथ ने रस की अनेक विशेषताओं का उल्लेख किया है[3] । यथा वह अखण्ड, स्वप्रकाशानन्द, चिन्मय, वेद्यान्तरस्पर्शशून्य, ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदर और लोकोत्तर चमत्कारप्राण है । उक्त विवेचन के आधार पर रस की चार प्रतिनिधि विशेषताएं सामने आती हैं –

---

3. सत्त्वोद्रेकादखण्ड: , स्वप्रकाशानन्द चिन्मय: ।
वेद्यान्तरस्पर्शशून्य: , ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदर: ॥
लोकोत्तरचमत्कारप्राण: कैश्चित् प्रमातृभि: ।
स्वाकारवदभिन्नत्वेनायमास्वाद्यते रस: ॥३।२, ३।

१. रस का आस्वाद आनन्दमय है।

२. रस ब्रह्मानन्द सहोदर है, अवक्तव्य है, एकच्छत्र है।

३. रस के आनन्द का प्राण चमत्कार है।

४. रस सचेतस संवेद्य है।

अब हम रस पर भरतमुनि के अभिमत के साथ तथा अन्य रसवादी आचार्यों की मान्यताओं के आधार पर विचार करेंगे। भरत की रस सम्बन्धी परिभाषा तो सुविदित है ही। भरत ने रसों की संख्या आठ ही मानी है क्योंकि नाटक में इनका ही अभिनय संभव है। नवाँ रस शम को भरत ने उसकी अनभिनेयता के कारण स्वीकार नहीं किया। भरत की मुख्य दृष्टि नाटक पर थी अत: वे रस की अभिनेयता और अनुभूति को ही प्रामुख्य देते थे। नाटक की भांति काव्य भी भावात्मक प्रभाव देता है; विचारो का तो उस में यत्किंचित् महत्त्व है। अत: नाटक की भांति काव्य भी रसानुभव कराता है। हमारे मानस की अतल गहराईयों में कुछ चिरसुप्त स्थायी भाव रहते हैं। उनके अनुकूल-बाह्य परिस्थितियां उन्हें जागृत एवं आन्दोलित अथच उद्दीप्त करती हैं। इस भाव-जागर्ता व्यक्ति को आलम्बन और उद्दीपक बाह्य प्रकृति आदि को उद्दीपन कहा जाता है। ये आलम्बन और उद्दीपन सम्मिलित रूप से विभाव कहे जाते हैं। विभाव की अवस्था तक भाव की स्थिति आन्तरिक ही रहती है उसमें किसी प्रकार की आंगिक क्रिया नही होती। किन्तु इस स्थिति के विश्वसनीय और परिपक्व हो जाने पर आरम्भकर्ता आश्रय जब अपनी मन:स्थिति को अंगसंचालनादि द्वारा प्रकट करता है तब उसे अनुभाव कहा जाता है। यह अनुभाव आंगिक क्रिया के साथ अंगचेष्टा एवं तद्भाव सूचक विभिन्न चिन्हों से भी प्रकट होता है। इस अनुभाव का प्रत्युत्तर आलम्बन अपनी जिस आंगिक चेष्टा से देता है वह हाव कहा जाता है। अनुभाव के पश्चात् आलम्बन और आश्रय की अनुकूल मनस्थिति की निश्चायकता स्पष्ट हो जाती है। इसके पश्चात् दोनों ही पक्षों में अनेकक्षणस्थायी लघुभावोर्मियां उठती है जो उक्त मन:स्थिति को परिपुष्ट करती हैं। इन्हीं क्षणिक किन्तु पोषक लघुभावोर्मियों को संचारी भाव कहा जाता है। इस प्रकार इन सभी विभाव, अनुभाव और संचारी भावों की धारा में प्रवाहित, परवर्धित एवं

अन्तत: परिपक्व हुआ स्थायी भाव ही रसावस्था को प्राप्त करता है। रस वस्तुत: किसी क्रिया की विभिन्न अवस्थाओं में परिपक्व स्थिति का भावात्मक स्वाद है। एक पिण्डीभूत अथ च स्थिर एवं अधिकारी मनोभाव जब विभिन्न भावधाराओं में परिप्लावित होकर हमारे सम्पूर्ण शरीर और सम्पूर्ण चेतना को द्रवीभूत, तरलित तन्मय कर देता है तो यही ठोस के व्यापक द्रवीकरण की क्रिया रस कही जाती है।

आचार्य भरत की, रस-परिभाषा में विद्यमान 'संयोगात्' और 'निप्पत्ति' शब्द अपनी व्यापकता और गंभीरता के कारण सुदीर्घ काल से विद्वानों के विचार का विषय रहे हैं। विभिन्न आचार्यों की मौलिक स्थापनाएं अत्यन्त महत्त्वपूर्ण हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त उक्त परिभाषा में 'स्थायी भाव' का उल्लेख नहीं है यह भी विचारणीय है। क्या आचार्य भरत विभाव, अनुभाव और संचारीभाव के संयोग से उत्पन्न एक सर्वथा नये भाव को या एक सर्वथा नयी मनस्थिति को ही रस मानते हैं अथवा 'स्थायी भाव' भी उक्त परिभाषा में अन्तर्निहित है। भरत रस की वस्तु-निष्ठता पर ही अटूट विश्वास रखते हैं अत: निश्चित रूप से रस के मूल में वे स्थायी भाव को रखते हैं, यही भाव या आशय उक्त परिभाषा से ध्वनित होता है। रस की अनुभूति कैसी होती है, किसको होती है और कब होती है, इस विषय पर ही अनेक आचार्यों ने अपने अपने ढंग से विचार किया है। आचार्य भरत के पश्चात् रुद्रट सब से पहले व्यक्ति हैं जिन्होंने प्रेयस् और शान्त नामक दो रस अधिकमाने हैं और इस प्रकार रसों की संख्या दस कर दी है। इनकी दृष्टि मूलत: काव्य पर थी अत: उक्त दो रसों की योजना ये और कर सके। रसानु-भूति के स्पष्टीकरण के सिद्धान्त पर इनके काव्यालंकार नामक ग्रन्थ में विचार नहीं किया गया है। भरतकृत रससूत्र के प्रतिनिधि व्याख्याता चार व्यक्ति हैं। भट्टलोल्लट, शङ्कुक, भट्टनायक, अभिनवगुप्त। इन चारो आचार्यों के रसानुभूति प्रक्रिया पर दिये गये मत अधोलिखित हैं।

१.	भट्टलोल्लट	का	उत्पत्तिवाद
२.	शंकुक	का	अनुमितिवाद
३.	भट्टनायक	का	भुक्तिवाद
४.	अभिनवगुप्त	का	अभिव्यक्तिवाद

उक्त प्रत्येक मत का संक्षिप्त आशय इस प्रकार है – भट्टलोल्लट के अनुसार विभाव और रस में कारण कार्य सम्बन्ध है। रति, शोक आदि स्थायी भाव नायिका आदि विभावों से जागृत एवं उद्दीप्त होकर, कटाक्ष, अंगप्रदर्शन, अश्रु आदि अनुभावों से व्यक्त होकर और संचारियों से तीव्र गत्या संचरित होकर अभिनेता में रसरूप हो जाते हैं। इस प्रकार रसस्थिति मूलतः रामादि मूल पात्रों में ही रहती है परन्तु नट में वह आरोपित होकर आ जाती है और दर्शकों को भी चमत्कृत करती है। भट्टलोल्लट की स्थापना में दो तथ्य महत्व के हैं –

१. विभाव और रस में कार्य कारण सम्बन्ध

२. अभिनेता में भी रस प्रतीति [मूल नायक के अतिरिक्त]।

समीक्षा –

लोल्लट ने विभाव और रस में जो कारण कार्य सम्बन्ध माना है वह असंगत है क्यों कि कारण कार्य सम्बन्ध में कारण [कुम्भकार] के नष्ट हो जाने पर कार्य [घट] विद्यमान रहता है, पर रस में तो कारण और कार्य साथ साथ ही रहते हैं। कारण के समाप्त होने पर कार्य भी समाप्त हो जाता है। लोल्लट की दूसरी स्थापना में यह आपत्ति उठती है कि अभिनेता में रसानुभूति कैसे होती है और दर्शक भी उसका आस्वादन कैसे करता है इसको उन्होंने स्पष्ट नहीं किया। भट्टलोल्लट ने रस के लौकिक विषयगत पक्ष को महत्ता दी है। उसके भावात्मक आस्वादन पर [जो कि दर्शक में ही संभव है] उनकी दृष्टि नहीं है। फिर अनुकार्य के निजी भावों का स्वाद अनुकर्ता को दूसरा भी आ सकता है। शृङ्गार के अवसर पर लज्जा और उत्साह के अवसर पर आलस्य या कायरता भी नट में आ सकती है। इसका समाधान लोल्लट न दे सके।

शंकुक –

आचार्य शंकुक नैयायिक थे। भट्टलोल्लट के मत की स्वालितियों से वे परिचित थे अतः उन्होंने रसानुभूति के लिए अनुमितिवाद की स्थापना की। नट में अनुकार्य की समस्त क्रियाओं और रसाङ्गों के परिपाक को देखकर तथा उससे पर्याप्त प्रभावित होकर दर्शक अनुमान बल से रसास्वादन करते हैं। यहाँ रत्यादि भाव मूलतः नट में नहीं होते पर दर्शक अपने वासनाबल [पूर्व संस्कारबल] से उन्हें

अनुमानित कर लेते हैं। यहाँ संयोग का अर्थ अनुमिति या गम्यगमक भाव है। इनका चित्रतुरङ्ग न्याय प्रसिद्ध है। शंकुक की मान्यता के अनुसार राम, दुष्यन्त आदि के भाव तथा संचारी भाव आदि अनुकर्ता के विभाव हैं और इनकी ही प्रतीति वह दर्शकों को अनुमिति के बल से कराता है। इस मत की स्थापना में त्रुटियां हैं। प्रथम त्रुटि यह है कि अनुमान ज्ञान का विषय है और रस मनोदशा का अत: दोनों की संगति संभव नहीं है। फिर अनुमान मिथ्या भी होता है अत: मिथ्या के आधार पर सत्य की प्रतीति नहीं हो सकती। दूसरी आपत्ति यह है कि अनुमान अप्रत्यक्ष होता है अत: उसकी पहुंच रस दशा तक कैसे हो सकती है। बाबू गुलाबराय के अनुसार "विचार या भाव सीधे प्रत्यक्ष अनुभव के आधार पर व्यञ्जना द्वारा भावना के विषय बनते हैं। सामाजिको की वासना तो अनुभव को रंग देगी किन्तु अनुमान अनुमान ही रहेगा।" इसके अतिरिक्त इस मत में इस महत्वपूर्ण बात पर भी विचार नहीं किया गया है कि मूल (रामादि) पात्रों के रति एवं शोकादि भाव सामाजिकों के कैसे हो सकते हैं। इन दोनों ही आचार्यों ने रस की सत्ता प्रेक्षक में नहीं मानी है।

भट्टनायक –

भट्टनायक ने रस की स्थिति को प्रेक्षक के हृदय में स्वीकार किया। मूल भाव, जो आलम्बन के प्रति नायक का है वही प्रेक्षक का हो यह कहना संभव, नहीं क्योंकि राम का सीता के प्रति जो भाव है वही प्रेक्षक का कैसे हो सकता है? पर भाव साधारणी कृत हो जाने पर प्रेक्षक स्वयं के स्थायी भावों का ही स्वाद लेता है। आनन्द या आस्वादन तो सामान्यीकृत स्थायी का होता है उसमें किसी का वैशिष्ट्य नहीं रह जाता। भट्टनायक ने रसानुभूति के लिए तीन शक्तियां मानी हैं – (१) अभिधा, (२) भावकत्त्व, (३) भोजकत्व। प्रथम अभिधा शक्ति के द्वारा पाठक या दर्शक के मन में शब्दार्थ के माध्यम से घटना की बाह्य कलेवर पर मूलक स्थूल प्रतीति होती है। द्वितीय (भावकत्त्व) की अवस्था में प्रथम प्रतीति का स्थूल ढांचा भावात्मक एवं विस्तृत हो जाता है। वह दर्शक की भावस्थिति को तैय्यार कर देता है। और तृतीय (भोजकत्त्व) अवस्था में तो व्यक्ति सांसारिक समस्त बन्धनों से सर्वथा मुक्त होकर उक्त भावस्थिति का भोग ही करने लगता है; यही रसानुभूति है। भट्टनायक की उक्त स्थापना का आशय यह है

कि प्रथम अवस्था में, प्रदर्शित भाव का स्थूल चित्र या रूपरेखा ही प्रस्तुत होती है। अर्थात् प्रदर्शित भाव, या पात्र से दर्शक का एक सामान्य परिचय ही प्रथम आवस्था में होता है। द्वितीय अवस्था में नट, मूलपात्र द्वारा प्रदर्शित भावधारा या स्थयीं भाव से दर्शक की निकटता स्थापित होती है। इस नैकट्य में स्थूल वैयक्तिक वैशिष्ट्य धीरेधीरे समाप्त हो जाता है और तृतीय अवस्था में तो व्यक्ति-विशेष की सत्ता सर्वथा समाप्त हो जाती है और व्यक्ति भाव का द्रवीभूत सामान्य अवस्था का ही भोग करता है। तृतीय अवस्था में दर्शक का समस्त अन्य सांसारिक सम्बन्ध विलीन हो जाता है और उसके समस्त मन-प्राण प्रदर्शित स्थायी भाव के साधारणी-कृत आस्वादन में डूब जाते हैं। यह ध्यान रखने का बात है कि भट्टनायक ने संयोग का अर्थ भोज्यभाव और निष्पत्ति का अर्थ भुक्ति माना है। यह धारणा सांख्यमतानुकूल हैं। इस मत के सम्बन्ध में अभिनवगुप्त ने आपत्ति उठाई है कि भावकत्त्व और भोजकत्त्व नामक दो शक्तियों की स्वतंन्त्र कल्पना अनावश्यक है। शास्त्रीय दृष्टि से भी ये अनावश्यक हैं। रसव्यञ्जना और रसास्वाद में उक्त दोनों क्रियाएं आ ही जाती हैं। भट्टनायक की भांति अभिनव गुप्त भी साधारणीकरण के समर्थक हैं।

अभिनवगुप्त –

आचार्य अभिनवगुप्त का रसानुभूतिविषयक सिद्धान्त अभिव्यक्तिवाद के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है। आपके सिद्धान्त स्थापना में वासनातत्त्व और साधारणीकरण का विशेष महत्त्व है। मनोवैज्ञानिक स्तर पर भी आपने सर्वप्रथम ध्यान दिया है। आचार्य अभिनव के अनुसार दर्शकों के हृदयस्थ मनो विकार जो वासना के रूप में सदैव रहते हैं विभाव अनुभाव और संचारी भावों से जागृत, उद्दीप्त एवं क्रिया-शील अथ च साधारणीकृत होकर, वे ही रसास्वाद की अवस्था को प्राप्त करते हैं। स्पष्ट है कि वासना या संस्कार रूप में अव्यक्त रूप से समाजिकों का स्थायी भाव ही विविध रसांगों से पुष्ट होकर सहृदयों के लोकोत्तर आनन्द का कारण बनता है। अनुकूल सहायक कारणों को प्राप्त कर सामाजिक का स्थायी भाव ही रसरूप में अभिव्यक्त हो उठता है।

इस प्रकार आचार्य अभिनवगुप्त ने रसानुभूति के सम्बन्ध में अत्यन्त

तर्कसम्मत, मनोविज्ञानमूलक एवं ठोस व्याख्या दी। इस व्याख्या के आधार पर, नाटक के साथ काव्यादि में भी रसास्वाद एवं रसस्थिति की संभावना के द्वार खुले।

परवर्ती व्याख्याता एवं विचारक आचार्यों ने प्राय: अभिनव गुप्त की मान्यता को ही स्वीकार किया है। आचार्य धनञ्जय का मत द्रष्टव्य है –

विभावैरनुभावैश्च सात्विकैर्व्यभिचारिभिः।
आनीयमानः स्वाद्यत्वं स्थायी भावो रस: स्मृत: ॥४।१।

भानुदत्त और विश्वनाथ भी रससिद्धान्त के प्रमुख व्याख्याता हैं। विश्वनाथ ने तो स्पष्टतया रस को ही काव्य की आत्मा स्वीकार किया है। आचार्य विश्वनाथ ने कोई नवीन स्थापना नहीं की। आचार्य मम्मट और जगन्नाथ ने भी रस के व्यापक महत्त्व को स्वीकार किया है। रसध्वनि को उत्तम काव्य का प्राण माना है।

इसके अतिरिक्त रस का एक सर्वथा नया रूप हमें रूप गोस्वामी की प्रसिद्ध रचना 'उज्ज्वल नीलमणि' में मिलता है। इस ग्रन्थ में वैष्णव भक्ति सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर रस की भक्तिमूलक व्याख्या की गई है। इस ग्रन्थ में भक्ति को एक स्वतन्त्र रस माना गया है। इस रस के शान्त, दास्य, सख्य, वात्सल्य और माधुर्य नामक पांच प्रकार माने गये हैं। ये सभी भाव कृष्ण के प्रति ही होते हैं।

सम्प्रदाय –

सादृश्य, बिम्बविधान और कल्पना का काव्य में प्रामुख्य आज निर्विवाद है। अलंकार के ही ये पोषक तत्त्व हैं। अलंकरण एक ओर यदि बाह्य सौन्दर्य ही है तो अन्त: सौन्दर्य से भी उसका नाता कम नहीं है। अपनी मर्मस्पर्शिनी अनुभूतियों के रू में ही अलंकार का जन्म छिपा है। अत: काव्योद्भव के साथ ही अलंकार की सत्ता भी चिरकालीन है।

ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से यह सम्प्रदाय भी अतिप्राचीन है। आचार्य भरत ने अपने नाट्यशास्त्र में मूलभूत चार नाटकाश्रयी अलंकारों की चर्चा की है। –

उपमा रूपकं चैव, दीपकं यमकं तथा।
अलङ्कारास्तु विज्ञेयाश्चत्वारो नाटकाश्रया: ॥ १–१७–४३.

ये उपमा, दीपक, रूपक तथा यमक अलंकार रसाश्रित बताये गये हैं। यद्यपि भरत की मूलदृष्टि रस पर थी वे अलंकारवादी न थे। वस्तुतः सम्प्रदाय के अन्तर्गत वे ही व्यक्ति (आचार्य) आते हैं जिन्होंने अलंकार को ही काव्य का सर्वस्व माना है। सामान्यतया सभी आचार्यों ने अलंकारों का विवेचन किया है।

आचार्य भामह इस सम्प्रदाय के संस्थापक हैं। अपने 'काव्यालंकार' में आपने प्रमुख रूपेण अलंकारों की महत्ता पर बल दिया हैं। भामह के अनुसार वक्रोक्ति में ही काव्य का सौन्दर्य है। वक्रोक्ति से भामह का आशय है बिम्बोत्पादनक्षम प्रभावक कथन पद्धति। भामह ने ३८ अलंकार माने हैं और उन में वक्रोक्ति को सर्वाधिक प्राधान्य दिया है — 'को अलंकारोऽनयाविना'। अलंकार के सम्बन्ध में आचार्य भामह की प्रसिद्ध उक्ति है —

'न कान्तमपि निर्भूषं विभाति वनितानानम्'

वस्तुतः सौन्दर्य वस्तु में तो नाममात्र को ही होता है। वह पूर्णतया व्यन्जना पर निर्भर करता है। कोई वस्तु या व्यक्ति स्वयं कितना ही सुन्दर क्यों न हो पर जबतक उसकी सशक्त एवं प्रभावक व्यन्जना नहीं होती तब तक वह मानस को अह्लादित नहीं कर पाता। भामह ने स्पष्टतया अलंकारों का प्राण वक्रोक्ति माना है और अलंकार को काव्य का प्राण माना है। अतः वे वक्ररीत्या वक्रोक्ति का ही समर्थन करते हैं। वे वक्रोक्तिवादी नही हैं। भामह ने अलंकार शब्द का प्रयोग ही 'काव्य-सौन्दर्य' के लिए बड़ी मौलिकता के साथ किया है।

भामह के पश्चात् दूसरे प्रसिद्ध अलंकारवादी आचार्य दण्डी है। दण्डी ने अपने काव्यादर्श में अलंकारों को विशेष महत्त्व प्रदान किया है। दण्डी ने काव्य में गुणों की महत्ता पर भी पर्याप्त बल दिया है — "काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मानलङ्कारान् प्रचक्षते" [काव्यादर्श २—१]। दण्डी ने काव्य में गुणों और रीति के लिए भी प्रर्याप्त महत्त्व स्थापित किया। दण्डी ने केवल ३५ अलंकारों को मन्यता दी और भामह के तीन अलंकार त्याग दिये। वक्रोक्ति के स्थान पर दण्डी ने 'अतिशय' को ही काव्य की आत्मा माना। वस्तुतः वक्रोक्ति और अतिशय में कोई भेद नहीं है।

इसके पश्चात् आचार्य उद्भट [८ वीं शती] ने अलंकारों की संख्या ४१ कर दी। इनका ग्रन्थ 'काव्यालङ्कारसारसंग्रह' पर्याप्त प्रसिद्ध है। इस ग्रन्थ के वैशिष्ट्य के प्रतिपादनार्थ प्रतिहारेन्दुराज ने एक अत्यन्त महत्त्व पूर्ण टीका भी लिखी थी।

इसके पश्चात् रुद्रट (९ वीं शती) भी ख्यातनामा अलंकार वादी हुए हैं। 'काव्यालङ्कार' नाम का आपका भी ग्रन्थ है। रस और अलंकार दोनों को रुद्रट ने काव्य में महत्ता प्रदान की है। रुद्रट ने अलंकारों के वैज्ञानिक वर्गीकरण का सर्वप्रथम नूतन प्रयास किया। रुद्रट ने वात्सल्य या प्रेयस् नामक दसवां रस भी माना है।

रुद्रट के पश्चात् अलंकारों पर कोई नया विचार या सिद्धान्तस्थापना नहीं हुई। परवर्ती आचार्य भोज, राजशेखर, रुय्यक, हेमचन्द, जयदेव, वाग्भट तथा अप्पय दीक्षित आदि आचार्यों ने अपनी अपनी कृतियों में अलंकार संख्यावृद्धि, परिभाषा की कांट छांट (अनावश्यक) और बेतु के वर्गीकरण ही किये। इन सभी में कहीं कहीं अवश्य हीं मौलिक प्रयास हुआ है। अन्ततः अलंकारों की संख्या १२० तक हो गई। यहाँ सब से अधिक ध्यान देने की बात यह है कि उक्त परवर्ती सभी आचार्यों ने अलंकारों की काव्य मै महत्ता, प्रभाव और आवश्यकता पर रंचमात्र भी दृष्टि नहीं रखीं। वर्णन, वर्गीकरण और विवरण के सत ही स्तरों पर ही इन आचार्यों की प्रतिभा उलझी रही।

भामह ने जिस स्वस्थ एवं ठोस धरातल पर अलंकार को स्थिर किया था; उसमें रस रीति, गुण और वक्रोक्ति का जो मधुर समावेश किया था, यदि आगे भी वही विकास क्रम चलता रहता तो आज भी अलंकार का ही काव्य पर आधिपत्य होता। समय के साथ गुण और रीति अपने अपने ढंग से अलंकार से पृथक हो गये और एक स्वतन्त्र सम्प्रदाय भी बन गये। रस और वक्रोक्ति का भी यही हुआ। मात्र अलंकार का एक भेद न रहकर वक्रोक्ति का स्वयं एक विराट् सम्प्रदाय ही बन गया। इतनी ही नहीं 'वक्रोक्तिः काव्य जीवितम्' भी घोषित हुआ। इसी प्रकार एक नवीन सम्प्रदाय 'ध्वनि सम्प्रदाय' भी आया जिसने रसस्थिति को और भी पुष्ट किया। आज स्थिति ठीक उल्टी हो गई है।

अलंकार स्वयं रीति, वक्रोक्ति और रस का अंगमात्र सा रह गया है। युग के बदलते मान दण्डों की वश्यता कौन अस्वीकार कर सकता है।

रीति सम्प्रदाय —

रीति सम्प्रदाय के प्रतिष्ठापक आचार्य वामन थे। रीति का विवेचन यद्यपि आचार्य भरत से ही होता आ रहा था; उसे काव्य में प्रतिनिधि एवं प्राणतत्त्व के रूप में प्रतिष्ठित करने का श्रेय आचार्य वामन को ही है। भरत ने रीति को काव्यगुण के रूप में, भामह ने वैदर्भी और गौडी इन दो काव्य प्रणालियों के रूप में तथा दण्डी ने रीति को गुणात्मिका या गुणनिष्ठ माना। दण्डी गुणवादी थे अतः उन्होंने दश गुणों को वैदर्भी रीति का प्राण माना। —

'इति वैदर्भमार्गस्य प्राणा दश गुणाः स्मृताः' [काव्यादर्श १।४२]

रीति और वक्रोक्ति के प्रखर बीज भामह में विद्यमान थे। आचार्य प्रवर वामन [८वीं शति] ने रीति में गाम्भीर्य और व्यापकता की अभूतपूर्व परख की और उसे काव्य की आत्मा "रीतिरात्मा काव्यस्य" [काव्यालङ्कार १, २, ६] घोषित किया। वामन ने मौलिक दृष्टि से रीति पर चिन्तन किया। विवेचन, वर्गीकरण एवं सिद्धान्त स्थापन में उनकी मौलिकता देखी जा सकती है। रीति विशिष्ट कोटि की पद संरचना है। इस में अनेक गुण विद्यमान रहते हैं। इस पदसंरचना पर ही काव्य की महत्ता निर्भर करती है। वामन ने वैदर्भी और गौडी के साथ पाञ्चाली रीति को भी स्वीकार किया। गौणी रीति को महत्ता प्रदान की। उसे आज गुण प्रधान बताकर उसके प्रति समाज में एक धारणा का नूतन बीजारोपण किया। वैदर्भी को तो वामन ने सर्वगुण सम्पन्न माना ही है। पाञ्चाली रीति में माधुर्य और सौकुमार्य गुणों को आचार्य वामन ने माना है। वामन ने दण्डी की भांति दश गुणों का अर्थ और शब्दगत न मानकर अर्थ और शब्द के स्वतन्त्रदश दश गुण माने हैं।

ऐसा प्रतीत होता है शैली के अनेक प्रकारों को ही रीति विश्वासी आचार्यों ने नये नाम दिये हैं। रीति को सम्प्रदाय का स्वतन्त्र महत्त्व देने के लिए सम्भवतः ऐसा किया गया। तो दूसरी ओर रीति और गुण का भी चक्र चल ही रहा था। गुण और रीति का पारस्परिक सम्बन्ध निश्चित होना था। वामन ने

ये दोनों समस्याएं उचित ढंग से सुलझाईं। शैली एक शास्त्रीय आधार पर प्रचलित अभिव्यक्ति पद्धति है पर उसमें वैयक्तिकता भी पर्याप्त रहती है। रीति एक निश्चित व्यवस्था है – भाषा और गुण दोनों के लिए। इसी प्रकार गुण रीति के बिना अप्रकट हैं और रीति गुणों के अभाव में खोखली। अतः दोनों एक दूसरे के पूरक है। वामन का असली मन्तव्य तो यह है कि गुण रीति के ही अंग हैं – उसके अन्तर्गत हैं। गुण और दोषों का सद्भाव एवं अभाव रीति के अन्तर्गत ही स्वीकृत हुआ। प्रारम्भ में गुण की स्वतन्त्र सत्ता ही न थी। दोषाभाव को ही गुण समझ लिया जाता था। अर्थात् दोषों की सत्ता भावनात्मक थी और गुण की निषेधात्मक या अभावात्मक। बाद में गुण को भी भावात्मकता प्रदान की गई और उनका भी स्वतन्त्र स्थान निर्धारित किया गया। आशय यह है कि गुण और दोष रीति सम्प्रदाय के अंग थे और दीर्घकाल तक रहे। अलंकार भी रीति का अंग मान लिया गया। अर्थात् रीति ऐसी पद-संरचना मानी गई जिसमें गुण हों, दोष न हों और अलंकार भी हों। परन्तु, जैसा कि आज सुविदित है कि धीरे धीरे दोष, गुण और अलंकारों का अपना स्वतन्त्र ही स्थान बन गया; वे किसी के (सम्प्रदाय के) अंगमात्र न रहे। कुछ और समय व्यतीत होने पर तो रीति को काव्य का केवल बाह्यांग ही माना जाने लगा। काव्यात्मा से उसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है यह मान्यता ही स्थिर हो गई। रस और ध्वनि सम्प्रदायों का आविर्भाव हुआ।

जहां तक इस सम्प्रदाय के विकास की बात है परवर्ती सभी आचार्यों ने रीति का महत्त्व स्वीकार किया है, भले ही यह महत्त्व अल्प ही माना हो। रुद्रट ने लाटी नामक चौथी रीति का आविष्कार किया। आनन्दवर्धन ने रस परिपाक में रीतिगत पदसंरचना का महत्त्व स्वीकार किया। कुन्तक ने रीति का प्रायः विरोध ही किया। वे रीति का विभाजन देशीय आधार पर न चाहते थे। अभिव्यक्ति देशविशेष से परिबद्ध नही हो सकती। भोज ने मागधी और अवन्तिका नामक दो रीतियां और प्रचलित कीं परन्तु वे चल न सकीं। मम्मट तथा विश्वनाथ आदि काव्यशास्त्राचार्यों ने भी रीति को काव्य के बहिरंग तत्त्व के रूप में ही स्वीकार किया है। ये आचार्य काव्य का लक्ष्य भावों और रसों की व्यंजना ही मानते थे। इस व्यंजना में रीति या शैली सहयोग दे सकते हैं, देते हैं, परन्तु इसीलिए वे स्वयं काव्यात्मा नहीं बन सकती।

वक्रोक्ति –

आचार्य कुन्तक [१० वीं शती उत्तरार्ध] वक्रोक्ति सम्प्रदाय के प्रवर्तक थे। पूर्ववर्ती आचार्यों [भामह, वामन, दण्डी आदि] ने भी वक्रोक्ति पर पर्याप्त विचार किया है। भामह ने तो समस्त अलंकारों के मूल में वक्रोक्ति को माना है। इतना होने पर भी वक्रोक्ति को अलंकार के एक अङ्ग से अधिक महत्त्व नहीं मिला। कुन्तक ने सर्वप्रथम वक्रोक्ति की बहुमुखी क्षमता पर विचार कर उसे काव्यात्मा के पद पर प्रतिष्ठित किया। वक्रोक्ति को कुन्तक ने 'वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणिति' रिति कहा है। स्पष्ट है कुन्तक वक्रोक्ति में बुद्धिगत चातुर्य और चमत्कार पूर्ण कथन को ही प्रामुख्य देते हैं। वक्रोक्ति में वस्तु अथवा विषय गौण होता है। कथन-कर्ता और श्रोता का मानस सम्बन्ध मुख्य होता है। वक्रोक्तिकार श्रोता के मन, ग्रहणशक्ति और स्थल आदि का ध्यान रखकर अत्यन्त चुस्त एवं प्रभावक ढंग से बात कहता है; फलतः बात तीर की भांति असरकर जाती है। स्पष्ट है कि क्या कहा गया की अपेक्षा कैसे कहा गया अधिक महत्त्वपूर्ण है। अभिव्यक्ति का कौशल ही काव्य का सर्वस्व है। अभिव्यक्ति यदि सशक्त हो तो श्रोता के मन में उल्लास आता ही है और हृदय भी अनेक रूपच्छवियों से भर उठता है। हृदय की अनुभूति भी यथासंभव अभिव्यक्ति से होती है। यह मानी हुई बात है कि अनुभूति को जागृत एवं क्रियाशील करना रस का कार्य है; ठीक इसी प्रकार मनोरंजन [मन को चमत्कृत] करना वक्रोक्ति का काम है। परन्तु, वक्रोक्तिकार कुन्तक के अनुसार वक्रोक्ति के द्वारा ही प्रत्येकस्तर के रसार की स्थिति उत्पन्न की जा सकती है। कुन्तक ने ध्वनि और रस को भी वक्रोक्ति के अन्तर्गत स्वीकार किया। रोचक अभिव्यञ्जना परिपक्व, शिल्पी कविहृदय से ही संभव है। गंभीर अनुभूति तो अनेक व्यक्ति कर सकते हैं पर क्या ये सभी व्यक्ति उसे सशक्त, प्रभावक एवं छविमयी अभिव्यक्ति भी दे सकते हैं? कुन्तक काव्य में अर्थगत रमणीयता को भी स्वीकार करते हैं। उनकी वक्रोक्ति की परिभाषा में विद्यमान विदग्धता शब्द अर्थगत रमणीयता का भी संसूचक है। कुन्तक ने वक्रोक्ति के छः भेद किये हैं :– वर्णवक्रता [पूर्वपद, उत्तरपद], पद-वक्रता, वाक्यवक्रता, प्रबन्धवक्रता और प्रकरण वक्रता। रस और अलंकारगत वक्रता भी इसमें ही सम्मिलित है। इन वक्रता भेदों पर विचार करने से कुछ तथ्य सामने आते हैं – यथा वर्ण और पदगत वक्रता के द्वारा कुन्तक शब्दयोजना

और शब्दालंकार की ओर संकेत करते हैं। वाक्यगत वक्रता के द्वारा अर्थालंकार संकेतित हैं। प्रकरण और प्रबन्धगत वक्रता रसदृष्टि से एवं चमत्कार संयोजन के निमित्त है।

यह सम्प्रदाय कुन्तक से प्रारम्भ होकर उनके साथ ही समाप्त हो गया। वक्रोक्ति को अलंकारों में पर्याप्त महत्त्व मिल चुका था अत: इसे एक पिष्टपेषण ही समझा गया। कुछ भी हो, कुन्तक की परम्परा में भले ही ग्रन्थ न लिखे गये हों; पर इसे अस्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि कुन्तक ने ही सर्वप्रथम काव्य उक्तिवैचित्र्य या कल्पना तत्त्व की पूर्ण प्रतिष्ठा की। कविदृष्टि को, उसके अभिव्यक्ति कौशल को चिर प्रतीक्षित सम्मान दिया। पश्चिम में क्रोचे जिस अभिव्यञ्जन वाद का जनक होकर अमर हो गया, उसके गहरे बीज आचार्य कुन्तक ने सैकडों वर्ष पहले ही भारतीय परम्परा को प्रदान कर दिये थे।

ध्वनि सम्प्रदाय –

सामान्यतया कानों से सुना जानेवाला नाद ही ध्वनि कहा जाता है। काव्य और दर्शन शास्त्र में ध्वनि एक निश्चित पारिभाषिक अर्थ में प्रयुक्त होनेवाला शब्द है। काव्य शास्त्र में तो इसकी महता अनेक रूपों में प्रकट की गई है। यथा –

१. वह व्यंजक शब्द जो ध्वनित करे या कराये।

२. वह व्यंजक अर्थ जो ध्वनित करे या कराये।

३. वह [वस्तु, रस, अलंकार] जिसकी व्यंजना करायी जाए।

४. वह शब्दशक्ति जिसके द्वारा व्यंजना कराई जाय।

५. वह काव्य जिसमें रस, वस्तु और अलंकारों का ध्वनन होता है।

स्पष्ट है कि ध्वनि शब्द – यंजक शब्द, व्यंजक अर्थ, व्यंजनाक्रिया तथा व्यंग्यकाव्य के लिए प्रयुक्त हुआ है। काव्य में शब्द और अर्थ तो शरीरमात्र हैं, उनसे व्यंजित होनेवाला तात्पर्य ही मुख्य है। ध्वनिवादियों के अनुसार काव्य में शाब्दिक रूप से जो कुछ कहा जाता है वह काव्य का लक्ष्य नहीं है; अपितु काव्य

का ध्वन्यार्थ ही काव्य का मुख्य प्रयोजन है। उत्कृष्ट काव्य का लक्ष्य स्थूल शब्दार्थ ज्ञान कराना नहीं है। भावों, संवेगों और रसों की व्यंजना ही उसका लक्ष्य है।

ध्वनि को सम्प्रदाय के रूप में प्रतिष्ठित करने का सर्वप्रथम श्रेय ध्वन्यालोक-कार आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन को है। ध्वनि सिद्धान्त इसके पूर्व था अवश्य, परन्तु सिद्धान्त और सम्प्रदाय के रूप में, काव्यात्मा के रूप में उसकी प्रथम प्रतिष्ठा आनन्दवर्धन ने ही की। इस सिद्धान्त के अनुसार काव्य के, ध्वनिकाव्य, गुणीभूत व्यंग्य और चित्रकाव्य ये तीन भेद किये गये। ध्वनि की महत्ता को दृष्टि में रखकर ही ये भेद किये गये हैं। जिस उक्ति में व्यंग्यार्थ का ही प्रामुख्य रहता है अर्थात् जिसमें वाच्यार्थ अत्यन्त गौण होता है और व्यंग्यार्थ ही मुख्य एवं चमत्कारी होता है, वह ध्वनिकाव्य कहलाता है।

ध्वनि के मुख्य दो भेद हैं – (१) संलक्ष्य क्रमध्वनि, (२) असंलक्ष्य क्रम ध्वनि। जहाँ वाच्यार्थ के माध्यम से व्यंग्यार्थ ग्रहण किया जाता है वहाँ संलक्ष्यक्रम ध्वनि होती है। यह ध्वनि वस्तुव्यंजना का प्राण है। असंलक्ष्यक्रम ध्वनि वहाँ होती है जहाँ वाच्यार्थ के बिना, शब्द सुनते ही सीधा व्यंग्यार्थ स्पष्ट हो जाय। इसी ध्वनि के द्वारा भावव्यंजना और रसव्यंजना होती है। ध्वनि के और भी अनेक भेद प्रभेद किये गये हैं, पर उक्त दो ही प्रमुख आधार हैं।

इस सिद्धान्त का प्रतिनिधि ग्रन्थ 'ध्वन्यालोक' दो लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति करता है। पहला है ध्वनि सिद्धान्त का संस्थापन और अलंकार, रस, रीति, वक्रोक्ति आदि का उसमें समाहार। दूसरा है काव्य में वस्तु और विषय की अपेक्षा अभिप्राय, संवेग और भावों का व्यंग्यदृष्टि से महत्त्व प्रतिपादन। आचार्य मम्मट और विश्वनाथ ने भी इस सम्प्रदाय का समर्थन किया। ध्वनि सिद्धान्त की प्रतिष्ठा के लिए मम्मट की देन महनीय है। कुन्तक ने ध्वनि को वक्रोक्ति में ही लीन कर दिया और उसकी स्वतन्त्र सत्ता ही न रहने दी। महिम भट्ट ने व्यञ्जना की उद्भावना को ही तर्क संम्मत न माना। अभिधा और लक्षणा को ही वे शब्द शक्ति मानते थे। भट्टतौत केवल अभिधा शक्ति ही मानते थे। मम्मट ने इस सबका खण्डन कर ध्वनि को पुनःप्रतिष्ठित किया। ध्वनि के भेदों की संख्या १०४४५ तक जा चुकी थी। आचार्य अभिनव गुप्त ने तो इस सम्प्रदाय को

विकास की पराकाष्ठा पर हीं पहुंचा दिया। उनका रस और ध्वनि विषयक अभिव्यंजना वाद सुविदित ही है। अभिनव गुप्त ने रस और ध्वनि को अन्योन्याश्रयी भी सिद्ध किया। ध्वनि के मूल में रस न हो तो वह खोखली एवं निर्जीव होगी। ठीक इसी प्रकार रस यदि व्यंग्य न हो तो उसमें चमत्कार एवं लोकोत्तरत्त्व न आ सकेगा।

पंडितराज जगन्नाथ ने भी ध्वनि की महत्ता प्रतिपादित की है। काव्य के चार भेदों — [उत्तमोत्तम, उत्तम, मध्यम, अधम] में उत्तमोत्तम अर्थात् ध्वनि काव्य को हीं उन्होंने श्रेष्ठतम माना है। काव्य की परिभाषा में भी पं. राज ने ध्वनि की महत्ता प्रतिपादित की है -- 'रमणीयार्थप्रतिपादकः शब्दः काव्यम्'। इस परिभाषा में 'रमणीयार्थ' और 'शब्दः' काव्य की ध्वनिमूलकता की ओर ही संकेत करते हैं।

औचित्य सम्प्रदाय –

चर्चित पांच सम्प्रदायों के कारण काव्य की वास्तविक आत्मा क्या है यह बात और भी अधिक उलझती जाती थी। प्रत्येक सम्प्रदाय के अपने पुष्ट तर्क थे ही अतः पाठक का किसी सही निर्णय पहुंचना प्रायः कठिन हो गया था। ऐसी स्थिति में आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र ने अत्यन्त सन्तुलित एवं वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि के साथ एक रचनात्मक कदम उठाया और प्रत्येक मत का काव्य में औचित्य सिद्ध किया। सुविधा की दृष्टि से उक्त पांचों सम्प्रदायों को काव्य के शरीर और आत्मा के आधार पर दो भागों में बांटा जा सकता है। अलंकार, रीति, वक्रोक्ति शरीरवादी हैं; रस और ध्वनि आत्मवादी हैं। शरीर के अभाव में आत्मा का अस्तित्त्व सिद्ध करना कठिन है और आत्मा के बिना शरीर का महत्त्व ही क्या है? अतः शरीर और आत्मा के समुचित सन्तुलन पर ही काव्य में पूर्णत्त्व आ सकता है। आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र को एक स्रष्टा की ठोस निर्मायक दृष्टि प्राप्त थी। अतः वे इस प्रकार का व्यापक एवं चिर अपेक्षित औचित्य सम्प्रदाय स्थापित कर सके। क्षेमेन्द्र की मौलिकता इस बात में ही है कि वे काव्यशास्त्र के बिखरते घटक सम्प्रदायों को एकसूत्र कर उनका सही मूल्यांकन कर सके और भविष्यत् के लिए भी काव्य के प्रति एक व्यापक एवं सुलझी हुई चेतना दे सके। काव्य में, विशेषतः प्रबन्ध में नीति, आदर्श, यथार्थ और कल्पना की एक मर्यादा आवश्यक है और दूसरी ओर कला-सौष्ठव की भी सीमाएं हैं। इनका ध्यान न रखने पर सामूहिक प्रभाव कभी स्वस्थ

नही हो सकता । अत: स्पष्ट है कि आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र ने काव्य में कुछ नैतिक, आदर्शमूलक एवं साहित्यिक व्यवस्था का यत्न किया, किन्तु किसी प्रतिभा को बन्दीनी बनाने की दृष्टि से कदापि नहीं । कवि या स्रष्टा स्वयं हीं औचित्य में बंधे यही काव्यपरम्परा की महानता है । आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र काव्य में अतिवादी प्रवृत्तियों में सन्तुलन और एक अनुशासन मूलक व्यवस्था चाहते थे । अत: वे कला और नीति के सुदृढ साहित्यिक स्तम्भों का काव्य में सानुपातिक योग हो यह स्वर लेकर उठे । काव्य व्यक्ति और समाज दोनों के लिए है अत: समाजिक मूल्यों का भी उचित योग उसमें होना चाहिए । क्षेमेन्द्र की स्थापना मूलत: व्यावहारिक समीक्षा को लेकर चली है । यद्यपि आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र के बहुत पहले ही भरत ने औचित्य पर प्रसंगवश संकेत किया है –

> अदेशजो हि वेषस्तु न शोभां जनयिष्यति ।
> मेखलोरसि बन्धे च हास्यायैवोपजायते ॥

अर्थात् अदेशज वेष अशोभन ही है । मेखला वक्षस्थल में बांधी जाने पर हास्योत्पादिका ही होती है ।

आनन्दवर्धनाचार्य ने भी औचित्य का महत्त्वांकन इस प्रकार किया है –

> अनौचित्यादृते नान्यद्रसभंगस्य कारणम् ।

अर्थात् रसभंग का मूल कारण अनौचित्य को छोडकर कोई अन्य नहीं ।

आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र ने तो औचित्य सिद्धान्त को एक व्यापक शास्त्रीय व्यवस्था ही दे दी । उनकी गहरी और व्यापक दृष्टि में किसी एक तत्त्व पर अडियल आग्रह नही है, अपि तु सभी तत्त्वों पर समान एवं औचित्य पूर्ण ममत्त्व है । अत: आचार्य क्षेमेन्द्र ने घोषित किया कि काव्य का स्थिर जीवन औचित्य में ही है –

> "औचित्यं रस सिद्धस्य स्थिरं काव्यस्य जीवितम्"

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

1.	Dr. H.S. Ananthanarayana	Reader in Linguistics, Osmania University, Hyderabad - 7.
2.	Dr. Chitra P. Sukla	Lecturer in Sanskrit, Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, Kaira District.
3.	Dr. S.G. Moghe	Lecturer in Sanskrit, Govt. College of Arts and Science, Aurangabad.
4.	Dr. Siddheswar Varma	Hony. Academic Adviser, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Chandigarh.
5.	Dr. V.P. Singh	Professor of Hindi, Benares Hindu University, Varanasi.
6.	Dr. A.D. Shastri	Professor of Sanskrit, Department of Sanskrit, M.T.B. Arts College, Surat.
7.	Sri B.C. Javali	Head of the Department of Kannada, Karnatak Arts College, Dharwar.
8.	Dr. V. Varadachari	Reader in Sanskrit, S.V. University, Tirupati.
9.	Sri M.S. Narayana Murti	Research Assistant in Sanskrit, S.V.U. Oriental Research Institute, Tirupati.
10.	Dr. V.N. Hari Rao	Reader in History, S.V. University, Tirupati.
11.	Dr. K. Rajayyan	Chief Professor of History, Presidency College, Madras-5.

12.	Sri D.T. Tatacharya	G.S. Mada Street, Tirupati.
13.	Sri N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya	Reader, Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, Tirupati.
14.	Dr. T. Kodandaramaiah	Reader in Telugu, S.V. University, Tirupati.
15.	Sri K. Dakshinamurthy	Lecturer in Sanskrit, S.V. University, Tirupati.
16.	Dr. R.K. Jain	Reader, Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Madras.

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

The following is the list of Sri Venkateswara University publications available for sale, at prices mentioned against them. S.V. University Oriental Journal is the only multi-lingual publication. It contains articles mostly in English and Sanskrit. In some of the numbers articles in Telugu or Tamil or Hindi also are published. All the other works are uni-lingual publications.

S. No.	Particulars of the Work			Price
				Rs.Ps.
1.	S.V. University Oriental Journal	Vol. I	Parts 1 & 2 (1958)	10–00
2.	-do-	Vol. VII	Parts 1 & 2 (1964)	10–00
3.	-do-	Vol. VIII	Parts 1 & 2 (1965)	10–00
4.	-do-	Vol. IX	Parts 1 & 2 (1966)	10–00
5.	-do-	Vol. X	Parts 1 & 2 (1967)	10–00
6.	-do-	Vol. XI	Parts 1 & 2 (1968)	10–00

ENGLISH

7.	Rupaka Sameeksha	1964	4–00
8.	Veda Sameeksha	1964	6–00
9.	Ramayana Sameeksha	1967	5–00
10.	The Temples of Kalinga by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1965	5–00
11.	Indian Aesthetics - Music and Dance by Sri K.S. Ramaswami Sastry	1966	1–50
12.	Administration and Society in the Carnatic by Dr. K. Rajayyan, M.A., Ph.D.	1966	8–00
13.	Select Kakatiya Temples by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1966	5-00
14.	A Study of Telugu Compounds by Dr. J. Suryanarayana, M.A., Ph.D.	1966	5–00
15.	A Study of Telugu Semantics by Dr. G.N. Reddy, M.A., Ph.D.	1966	4–50
16.	The Philosophy of A.N. Whitehead in the light of Advaita Vedanta of Sankara by Dr. P. Nagaraja Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1966	3-00

17.	The Valies of Shavian Drama by Dr. S. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1966	4–00
18.	The Srirangam Temple by Dr. V.N. Hari Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1967	16–50
19.	Ikshvakus of Vijayapuri by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1967	9–00
20.	Student Performance and Adjustment by Dr. S. Narayana Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1967	9–00
21.	Inscriptions of Andhra Desa, Vol. I by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1967	17–25
22.	Geometrization of Dynamics by Dr. P.S. Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1967	10–00
23.	Inscriptions of Andhra Desa, Vol. II. Part I by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.	1967	35–00
24.	Historical Grammar of Telugu language with special reference to old Telugu by Dr. K. Mahadeva Sastry, M.A., D.Litt.,	1969	20–00
25.	An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit, Telugu and Tamil Manuscripts (palm-leaf and paper) in the Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Research Institute Library, Tirupati	1956	10–00

SANSKRIT

26.	Gajagrahaṇaprakāra of Nārāyaṇa Dīksita Ed. by Dr. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D	1968	2–50
27.	Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇya-sādhanam of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭapāda Ed. by Dr. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D	1968	0–75
28.	Kāvyāmṛtam of Śrīvatsalāñchana Ed. by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971	Price to be fixed.

TELUGU

29.	Thyagaraja's Prahlada Bhakti Vijayam by Prof. P. Sambamurthy	1965	7–00

TAMIL

30.	Muthollayira Vilakkam by Sri N. Subbu Reddiar	1965	7–00